

AN EXPOSURE  
OF THE  
MISCHIEVOUS PERVERSIONS  
OF  
HOLY SCRIPTURE

IN  
THE NATIONAL TEMPERANCE SOCIETY'S  
PUBLICATIONS,  
ADDRESSED TO MEN OF SENSE AND CANDOUR:

BY  
REV. JOHN CARRY, D. D.,  
OF PORT PERRY.

---

"We must not stint  
Our necessary actions, in the fear  
To cope malicious censurers."

—*Shakespeare.*

---

TORONTO:  
PRINTED BY ROWSELL & HUTCHISON.  
1885.

*The* EDITH *and* LORNE PIERCE  
COLLECTION *of* CANADIANA



*Queen's University at Kingston*

AN EXPOSURE  
OF THE  
MISCHIEVOUS PERVERSIONS  
OF  
HOLY SCRIPTURE  
IN  
THE NATIONAL TEMPERANCE SOCIETY'S  
PUBLICATIONS,

ADDRESSED TO MEN OF SENSE AND CANDOUR:

BY  
REV. JOHN CARRY, D. D.,  
OF PORT PERRY.

---

"We must not stint  
Our necessary actions, in the fear  
To cope malicious censurers."

—*Shakespeare.*

---

TORONTO:  
PRINTED BY ROWSELL & HUTCHISON.  
1885.

## CONTENTS.

---

### CHAPTER I.

The Dishonesty of Temperance Partisanship.	. . .	5
--	-------	---

### CHAPTER II.

Examination of Temperance Appeals to the Bible.	. .	15
---	-----	----

### CHAPTER III.

The Witness of Christian History Misrepresented.	. .	47
--	-----	----

### CHAPTER IV.

The Witness of Fact Crystalized in Christian Phrase.	. .	57
--	-----	----

### CHAPTER V.

- Temperance Misuse of Scripture.	. . . .	67
-----------------------------------	---------	----

### CHAPTER VI.

Specimens of Texts Perverted.	. . . . .	73
-------------------------------	-----------	----

## CHAPTER I.

### THE DISHONESTY OF TEMPERANCE PARTISANSHIP.

“It was the duty of men to abstain from lying a great deal more than they did.”—*T. Carlyle.*

Temperance is so expressly declared in holy Scripture to be a “fruit of the Spirit,” and has held such a recognized position among the moral virtues, from the days of Aristotle to this moment, that its claims upon us both as men and Christians cannot be disputed; and we say of it what St. Paul says of the truth, “We can do nothing against temperance, but for temperance.” But this honourable word has been of late years, for the first time in the history of language, emptied of its moral and sacred significance, and has been injuriously misapplied to entire abstinence from the use of inebriating liquors, and, with a still wider departure from its proper meaning, to the legal prohibition of their manufacture, sale, or use. In urging upon us this amazing innovation, a thing never heard of in Christendom from the beginning, another novelty is mainly relied upon, and indeed is very reasonably felt to be necessary as a sure corner-stone for this composite structure of political, social, and religious error—that is, a change in the meaning of the word “wine,” whereby it is made to include non-fermented liquors, and the further principle of Biblical interpretation that where wine is commended in the Bible it is to be always understood as unfermented,

but where inebriating, it is always condemned. For the furtherance of these views, as a strong foundation for individual abstinence and legislative prohibition, an extensive literature has sprung into existence, ranging from hundreds of tracts, leaflets, and pamphlets up to elaborate volumes, the head-quarters of which in this continent is New York. There "The National Temperance Society" has its "Publication House," and thence its literature overspreads the Dominion through the agency of an active propaganda. This is the armoury which supplies the weapons of prohibitionist preachers, writers, and lecturers. Occasionally, indeed, is found a muffled and blushing acknowledgment that it is going too far to claim Bible authority for the repudiation of alcohol in all its forms; but with scarcely noticeable exceptions this extravagance is battled for through thick and thin, *per fas et nefas*. In the heat of extempore oratory, whether pulpit or platform, the indeliberate misrepresentation of Scripture is pardonable; but when misrepresentation is reduced to an art, and practised as a profitable industry by authors and publishers, it is monstrous to plead, Yes, truth is sacrificed; but it is to temperance! It is a horrid confession, hateful to God and man. Any serious moral perversion of this sort must ultimately be productive of wide-spread mischief, of moral disaster, unhinging the public conscience, and preparing for worse evils than the one we would be rid of. In undertaking to expose the unsoundness of these miscalled Biblical arguments and the utter untrustworthiness of the writers, I do not dream for a moment of discussing all their inanities, for this would be to write a very big book instead of a pamphlet, nor do I intend to discuss their many gro-

tesque specimens of learned dissertation ; but I do promise to adduce examples enough of both to overturn their position, and, in the judgment of sober minds, to destroy the authority of the writers as guides. Instead, too, of wandering through a maze of tracts, which have no connexion, save their identity of object and their iteration of the cuckoo cry, "Alcohol condemned by the Bible," I shall confine my examination chiefly to the two completest treatises of the Society, with an occasional glance beyond. The largest is entitled "The Divine Law as to Wines ; established by the testimony of sages, physicians, and legislators against the use of fermented and intoxicating wines ; confirmed by their provision of unfermented wines to be used for medicinal and sacramental purposes. By G. W. Samson, D.D., former President of Columbian University, Washington, D.C." It is a volume in 12mo., of 467 pages. The other is, "Bible Wines ; or The Laws of Fermentation, and Wines of the Ancients. By Rev. Wm. Patton, D.D.," 12mo., pp. 139. Nothing could be more pretentious than Dr. Samson's book. Every page bristles with learned names, often mis-spelt, and with the most heterogeneous scraps of learning, better calculated to bewilder than to enlighten ; so that on completing the wearisome task of reading this *Opus magnum* of the cause, the reflection arose spontaneously : As a bull in a china shop, so is Dr. Samson in a library. The glittering fragments scattered by the former would be as much a dinner-service, as the learned scraps of the latter are argument. Before addressing myself to the Biblical perversities of the book :

1. I shall, first of all, note some of the blunders, or the falseness of this champion, to show how much he is to be relied on. The only puzzle is, where to begin. On p. 226 we read: "Any one disposed to an exhaustive study in this line can trace it in the numerous folios of the '*Acta Sanctorum*,' compiled by the Jesuit Bollandus, and published at Antwerp, A.D. 1643." Now this series has extended to sixty volumes, the last being published, I believe, in 1884; of these but *two* were published in 1643, and Bolland worked only upon the first eight (see *Contemp. Rev.* for Jan., 1883). Would any sane man send us for observations on wine to these enormous folios, naming neither volume nor page? It is clear that Dr. Samson has never looked upon the set, and does not even know the facts of their literary history; but it awes a Canadian farmer to hear an American professor, in his best hifalutin, boast of being "an independent explorer in the folios of universal Christian literature!" On the same page he has a scrap from Aquinas, quoting him by "Books," whereas there is no such manner of division in his "Summa." Again, claiming (p. 236) Luther's version of the Bible as on his side, he says: "Here it must be recalled that Luther had the exhaustive scholarship of men like Castell, in his Heptaglott Lexicon, and of Cocceius to sustain him." Luther published his New Testament in 1522, and, aided by Justus Jonas and Melancthon, the Old Testament eight years later: but Castell's Lexicon was published in 1669, and the preface to Cocceius's Hebrew Lexicon is dated 22nd April of the same year; that is, 139 years after Luther's work was done! This is a plain imposition of sounding names upon the unlearned. Nor is the palpable cheat



relieved by the qualifying "men like Castell." Who were they?

I may here observe that it is, at best, a laughable folly to claim Luther as a patron of total abstinence, as Dr. Samson does throughout his book. If the couplet ascribed to him be not his, it certainly was so ascribed as representing his mood:

Wer liebt nicht Weib, Wein, und Gesang,  
Er bleibt ein Narr sein Leben lang.

Who does not love his wife, wine, song,  
Abides a fool his whole life long.

A Lutheran minister reminds us that at Worms, where Luther made his memorable confession: "Here I stand; I cannot do otherwise; God help me. Amen," Duke Erich sent him a jug of the renowned Einbeck beer, which Luther accepted thankfully, saying to the messenger: "As Duke Erich thinks of me at this hour, so may our Lord Jesus Christ think of him in his last hour." The same minister, the Rev. Chas. F. Spring, of New Hamburg, quotes from a sermon of Luther's: "God and man allow you to drink temperately, not only in time of need, but also on your days of joy and honour." That is scriptural enough: "Drink wine with a merry heart."

On p. 135, he quotes Virgil (Georg. i.) describing the occupations of a small farmer during the lengthening autumnal evenings, and makes it "his own rural home," while he translates "ferroque faces inspicit acuto" by "sharpening his tools," instead of making slivers of dry pine to serve for

candles, as did many an early settler in the back-woods, or of bog-wood, as used to do the poor Irish when I was a boy. I often saw the bunches for sale.\* On pp. 380, 385, this would-be miracle of learning shows his ignorance of the gender of a common Latin noun: "ignava pecus," twice, for "ignavum."

But there are other blunders, far more numerous than his pages, which I know not whether to describe as blunders or falseness; both, I am inclined to think, as he must have picked them up at second-hand, either unable or not caring to verify his statements. On p. 445 we have: "A self-forgetfulness recognized by Longinus as characterizing the eloquence of the great Christian Apostle Paul, which made him heedless of critics on oratory, rhetoric, and even on grammar, while his grand mind was aglow with the conceptions of vital truth." All this is made out of "Paul of Tarsus whom I even affirm to stand foremost in the teaching of such doctrine as does not admit of proof." On p. 209, "Athanasius, who *ruled* at the Council of Nice, A.D., 325." He was not so much as a member of it, attending only as a theologian, being but a young man. On p. 229, foll., this "independent explorer in the folios" makes the most ridiculous figure in discussing the relations of the Greek and Latin churches, whose contentions he imagines to exist partly in the Greeks insisting on "unfermented or greatly diluted wines at the Sacrament!" It would take too long to expose

\* Some of the commentators on Virgil explain the verb to mean fashioning into the shape of an ear of wheat, and then splitting up as a sort of torch.

his absolute unacquaintance with this whole subject. Some indistinct echoes of their contention about leavened bread in the Eucharist, and some hazy notion of the ceremony of mingling water in the Eucharistic Cup, have reached him, and his teetotal imagination has transformed them into an authority for the National Temperance Literature readers. But his most daring feat in this line is probably the following : He first assumes St. Jerome to have been an anti-alcoholist, and then makes him the author of the Mohammedan prohibition of wine ! “The teachers of Mohammed were his wife’s uncle, a learned Jew, and a Greek Christian, who led him *especially to the study of Jerome*, whose statements as to intoxicating wine we have just considered,” p. 217. First of all, the story of that Greek Christian, an apostate goldsmith, is exploded. Secondly, it is not very credible that a Greek Christian should lead him to the study of Latin fathers. Thirdly, there is no trace of all this in Gibbon, Milman, Sale, Badger, Stobart, Osborn, Brewster’s Cyclopædia, or any authority respecting Mohammed that I can lay my hands on. It is an invention of the learned President, who thinks it a short cut to persuading fools. But this admired Mohammed differed seriously from Dr. Samson ; for believers, though forbidden wine in this world, are taught to expect “rivers of wine, delicious to those who quaff it,” in paradise, (Sura xlvii. 16). But I have given instances enough of blundering, ignorance, and recklessness to show what a false guide this man is, and how much he is to be distrusted in every word he writes.

2. It will be useful to see how completely he contradicts

and, what is more, confutes himself. Much of his and Dr. Patton's labour is expended on proving that ways of preventing the fermentation of grape-juice were known to the ancients, such as boiling, certain chemical processes, throwing in calcareous earths, keeping in cold water, or burying in the earth, frequent straining and decanting ; and that this liquid was not intoxicating, yet was called wine. We are assured that now, as of old, grape-juice, if the air be carefully excluded, will not ferment, and becomes in time a wholesome un-intoxicant. All this is true ; but every word and fact are against the positions which they are meant to support. (1) The careful, costly, elaborate methods of preventing a natural process show clearly that a dainty *liqueur* for the rich was thus produced, and not a drink for the people at large. (2) That man's art is absolutely necessary to prevent a result provided for by the God of nature, is the best possible proof that our use of fermented wines is the very purpose of God. Dr. Samson quotes at large the conclusions of Mons. Pasteur, the most eminent experimentalist living, to the effect that fermentation can be prevented "by shutting off contact with the air," and in four other ways enumerated. Dr. Sampson adds also the authority of Gay Lussac : "I conclude that the fermentation of grape-juice cannot commence without the aid of oxygen gas," that is, without contact with the air, which the art of man must exclude. And yet fermentation is the devil's work ! This is no small blasphemy. (3) Dr. Samson's own authorities confute him. On p. 353, *et seq.*, he quotes from the "Dictionnaire des Sciences Medicales," presenting the researches of sixty-one physicists and physicians. From the observations under the word "Vin," I take a few sen-

tences : "The name of *dumb* or *mute* wines is given to those which are made from must whose first as well as second fermentation has been *prevented*. \* \* It is wrong to have given it the name *dumb wine*, since there is wanting in it the *spirituous principle which constitutes the essence of wine*. \* \* Besides, this must does not preserve always its sweetness, for when the heat of spring makes itself felt, it begins to ferment, it loses its sweetness, and it *becomes a veritable wine*." Thus the idea of unfermented *wine* is knocked on the head, as a monster ignored by science. Again, from p. 402, I give Dr. Samson's own elegant translation of Aristotle : "Wine, the sweet, indeed evaporates ; for being glutinous, it also in these respects acts like oil ; for under cold it becomes viscid, and inflammable. It is, indeed, in name wine ; in its operation,\* however, it is not, for the liquid is not wine-like ; wherefore also it does not intoxicate."

Now prepare for the beauty of Dr. S.'s inference : "Aristotle among the Greeks, like the medical encyclopedist among the modern French wine-makers, simply emphasizes the fact that there is a wine, *properly so called*, which has not the quality of fermented wines"!!! A plain falsehood in set terms, as every reader sees. What a worthy teacher of innocent Canadians ! Again : he brings forward Pliny, as "another link in the chain of testimonies as to unfermented wines," p. 142. "Stating that this *αιγλευκος*, or *always must*, is made by preventing the juice from fermenting, he defines fermentation thus : 'So they call the passing over of must into wines.' " And yet Pliny, Aristotle, and the

\* *εργα*, ergo is really.

Encyclopedist, who all deny that unfermented must is wine, are so many "links in the chain of testimonies" to the very contrary! This would be an audacious insult, if it were not rather a piece of utter idiocy, the product of this mad argument.

I have now sufficiently shewn what may be expected from such "blind guides" when they lay their hands on the sacred Scriptures. It is not too much to say, that in not one single instance are they to be trusted, and that their errors are not only as numerous as their pages, but as the texts they quote. If any document of history, or any private letter or speech, were as unjustly and perversely construed as the words of the Bible are, the perverters would be deservedly stigmatized as the worst of men, and even driven from the society of their fellows. Before these pages are closed, I shall have to furnish, to my own sorrow, the amplest proofs of this charge.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### EXAMINATION OF TEMPERANCE APPEALS TO THE BIBLE.

ὁ βούλεται γὰρ μόνον ὄρῳ καὶ προσδοκῶν,  
ἀλόγιστός ἐστι τῆς ἀληθείας κριτής.—*Menander.*

ROUGHLY TRANSLATED.

A senseless judge of truth is he who sees  
And looks for nought but what himself may please.

1. As Dominion Temperance people are supplied with Bible lore from the National Society, N. Y., so has the society been "replenished with soothsayers from the east." The English *Temperance Bible Commentary* has been a book of great authority, and is still the great magazine of Biblical arguments resorted to by such Temperance men as think the Bible of some consequence. Perhaps the noblest Grecian in England is the venerable Dr. Field, whose life has been one of passionate devotion to Greek learning.\* He is the renowned editor of S. Chrysostom's Homilies for the University of Oxford, of Origen's Hexapla, and of the Septuagint; and confuting, as he does triumphantly, the new rendering of 1 Tim. vi. 10, "The love of money is a root of all evil," which is that of the Temperance Commentary, he observes: "Instead of 'rightly dividing the Word of Truth,' the present motto of this work, I would suggest the following from Menander"

\*Since dead.



(which I have placed at the head of this chapter). Whoever reads his Greek Testament, and is not yet acquainted with Dr. Field's *Otium Norvicense, pars tertia*, will not fail to thank me for this notice, if he should get that admirable little work. The suggested motto will show us what to expect in the admirers of the Temperance commentary. We find drunken maunderings about *yayin* and *tirosk* till one's stomach is ready to turn at the folly and the nasty suggestiveness. I have but a few pages for what they devote hundreds to, but I do not despair of being able to say all that is really necessary in the space at my disposal. To begin with :

YAYIN, wine. This, they say, is a generic term, covering grape juice in all its forms, whether intoxicating or not ; where intoxicating, it is neither commended nor used as the symbol of good. It occurs about 140 times in the Old Testament. Now, I shall rest the opposite cause on three texts, and I might confidently do so on one, the first, the two others being unnecessary props. In

ISAIAH xxv. 6, the Gospel "feast for all people" is described, its dainties being "fat things full of marrow, of wines on the lees well refined." I prefer giving here, to any words of my own, the comment of a Hebraist of world-wide fame, Dr. Franz Delitzsch, out of many consenting authorities. "The figure is taken, as in Ps. xxii. 26 *et seq.*, from the sacrificial meals connected with the *shelamim* (peace offerings). *Shemarim mezukkakim* are wines which have been left to stand upon their lees after the first fermentation is over, which have thus thoroughly fermented, and have



been kept a long time (from *shamar*, to keep, *specially* to allow to ferment), and which are then filtered before drinking (Gr. οἶνος σαρκίας, *i. e.*, διυλισμένος or διηθιζὸς, from διηθεῖν, *percolare*), hence wine both strong and sweet....The thing symbolized in this way is the full enjoyment of blessedness in the perfected kingdom of God." The latest learned English commentator, Cheyne, says : "Wines on the lees, *i. e.*, wine that has been left on its lees, or sediment, to heighten its strength and flavour ; comp. Jer. xlviii. 11." Now, the best confirmation of these sufficient words is to be found in the pages of repetition that Drs. Samson and Patton furnish to shew that, by frequent straining of must before fermentation is completed, the vinous strength or intoxicating power is diminished ; and, consequently, that the wine allowed to rest upon its lees would have its spirituous strength in full measure. But Jer. xlviii. 11, will throw no little light on Isaiah's words : "Moab hath been at ease from his youth, and he hath settled on his lees, and hath not been emptied from vessel to vessel, neither hath he gone into captivity : therefore his taste remained in him, and his scent is not changed : " that is, Moab had unimpaired national strength and prosperity, like old wine that has both spirit and bouquet.

I think I may defy the banded powers of Temperance ingenuity and learning, to hold *this* position. Here is one glorious text where intoxicating wine is the symbol of the highest blessings of redeeming grace, and this one text alone dashes their despicable idol to the ground as helpless as Dagon. But as the men of Ashdod "took Dagon and set him in his place again," so by a plain *LIE* does Dr. Patton

erect his idol in the presence of the Ark of God. On p. 61, giving the significations of *shemarim* (lees), he has "Isa. xxv. 6, *fat things*"!! I ask any reader, with a tinge of virtue, is my word "lie" strong enough without a strong epithet? Now for the buttressing texts. In Gen. xlix. 11, 12, is given, as part of the blessing of Judah: "Binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass's colt unto the choice vine; he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes: his eyes shall be red with wine." Need I do more than refer, with the margin of our English Bible, to Prov. xxiii. 29, "Who hath redness of eyes?" Jacob makes no commendation of excess, but expresses poetically the great abundance in store for royal Judah. Redness of eyes is hardly to be attributed to grape-syrup any more than to maple-syrup. N.B.—Doctors Samson and Patton in quoting these verses leave out "his eyes shall be red with wine!" Talk of Jesuitry after that! They simply *mean* to deceive. The only other text I shall adduce under this head is Cant. i. 2, "Let Him kiss me with the kisses of His mouth: for Thy loves (margin) are better than wine," *yayin*. Here we have the rapture and the intoxication of love (the figure of holy affection to our Redeemer) compared with wine, and set above it; but if the wine meant be only a sweet, non-stimulating syrup, it is such a comparison as would be deemed little complimentary in human life, and such as no poet, following nature, would or could have written. Comparing, however, Ps. civ. 14, "wine that maketh glad the heart of man," and Prov. xxxi. 6, 7, the force and propriety of the expression become at once apparent, and the last nail that need be driven in the coffin of the "Bible Temperance"

delusion is struck home. But in further illustration of this verse, pray compare vii. 9, "And the roof of thy mouth like the best wine (*yayin*\*) for my beloved, that goeth down sweetly, causing the lips of those that are asleep to speak." "Going down sweetly" (Margin, Heb. *straightly*) is the identical phrase so familiar to Temperance readers in Prov. xxiii. 31, "when it moveth itself aright," but which should be translated as in the Canticles here. "Goes straight down" well describes the acceptableness of the liquor, which, I guess, were it only a sweet syrup, would not be likely to make the sleepers' lips to speak! Maurer's Commentary is quoted elsewhere with approbation by Dr. Samson. I translate its observations here: "*Which goes*, descends through the throat, *straight*, i. e., because of its pleasant taste it goes down very easily. *It creeps through the lips of the sleepers*, through the lips into the throat of the sleepers softly and sweetly it slips, and so slipping it readily inebriates and brings placid sleep." *Creeps*: this is the translation of Gesenius also, "*to flow softly*, e. g., wine, Cant. vii. 10." Maurer adds: "The adjective *sleeping* is taken from what has been previously expressed, and serves only to describe fully the best wine." Fuerst, agreeing with our English translation, observes in his lexicon on the form *dovêr*, "causing to speak": "of fiery wine, Song of Sol. vii. 10: making talkative the lips of those asleep, i. e., the wine is so fiery that the intoxicated in their sleep speak aloud while dreaming." And yet *yayin* here describes the highest thing in heaven, the love of the Divine Bridegroom, Christ, to His

\* Heb. *yayn*, which some think a shortened form, though it is more certainly the construct state.

Spouse, the Church. Enough! clear it is, that were the "Bible Temperance" idea to prevail, this Book would have to be banished from the Bible, and meantime must be very lightly esteemed.\*

'ASIS, the new wine "trodden out," occurs in five places. Dr. Samson says, "it is evidently a carefully prepared must, or unfermented wine." Fermented or not, it was intoxicating, as clearly appears from Isa. xlix. 26, where God says of the enemies of His people, "they shall be drunken with their own blood as with '*asis*, sweet wine." Marg. *new wine*. And from Joel i. 5, "Awake, ye drunkards, and weep; and howl, all ye drinkers of wine, because of the new wine, '*asis*; for it is cut off from your mouth." This was the punishment of their abuse of it, as well as of their other sins; and yet in iii. 18, the restoration of this intoxicating drink is promised with other good things to repentant Israel. Again, I ask, is Dr. Samson honest? is not the Bible Temperance theory a delusion? See also Amos ix. 13.

TIROSH, however, which occurs about forty times, is the favourite talking ground of our literary Temperance men. It is translated in our English Bible by wine or new wine. Let us hear the Temperance Bible Commentary: "Tirosh is not wine at all, but the fruit of the vineyard in its natural con-

\*Since the above was written the Revised Old Testament has appeared. I beg the reader to turn to Isa. xvi. 8, 9, and note the margin at verse 8. In both Versions alike the prophet weeps over the destruction of the Vine of Sibmah renowned for the potency of its wine.

dition." But hear Solomon, on the other side : "Thy presses shall burst out with *tirosk*," Prov. iii. 10 ; and Isa. lxii. 8. "The sons of the stranger shall not drink thy *tirosk*." Again, Dr. Samson says : "Modern investigations lead to the conclusion that *tirosk* was *must*, or unfermented wine," p. 70. So Dr. Norman Kerr, who says that Hos. iv. 11, is "the only apparent exception ;" while Dr. Patton says : "So uniform is the good use of this word that there is but one doubtful exception." I deny that there is a particle of doubt about it. But the most unlearned can judge in this case. Here are the words : "Whoredom and *yayin* and *tirosk* take away the heart," *i. e.*, the *understanding*, as "heart" in Hebrew so often means.

Now can it be thought that a sweet syrup is to be classed with whoredom and the excessive use of intoxicating drink in its immoral effects ? None but such as are besotted by this modern idiocy can believe it. But, it is asked by Dr. Patton, "if *yayin* and *tirosk* each means intoxicating wine, then why use both ?" Even if we could not answer, that would not destroy a fact which exists independently of our understanding. The answer, however, is not far to seek : *yayin* was the ordinary drink all the year round, whether casked or bottled ; but the coming in of the new wine, *tirosk*, would be the occasion of special indulgence, the chief drinking-bout of the season. Read Isa. xvi. 10. But most appositely is an illustration found in tract No. 214, p. 12, of the society's list. It is the testimony of two American Missionaries from Persia. "They, the Persians, have large earthen jars, one-third sunk in the ground, and still so high

that a man must stand on a stool to reach the top. These are filled with grape-juice, a sheep-skin is stretched over the mouth and plastered with clay. After some two months it is fermented, but, as it will turn to vinegar in a few weeks if opened, a man invites his friends, and for a week or ten days, till his jar is empty, they continue in a state of beastly intoxication. After a time a neighbour opens one of his jars, and a similar scene is enacted." It was a special time of drinking. Can the largest charity excuse Dr. Patton in such an evasion as the following? "*Tirosh* may represent luxury, and, in this application, dishonesty, as *tirosh* formed a portion of the tithes, rapacity in exaction, and perversion in their use, is fitly charged with taking away the heart"! Supposing all the rest of the forty places were doubtful, would it not be common sense, and a matter of moral obligation, to explain them by one example so indubitable as this; instead of, in the interest of a baseless theory, darkening and perverting what was plain? But though this much is enough, let me briefly give the judgments of the Hebrew Lexicographers upon *tirosh*.

GESENIUS: "(root *yarash*) *New wine*, so called because it gets possession of the brain, and inebriates." His learned translator, Dr. Robinson, adds: "All the passages go to show, that *tirosh* is *new wine* of the first year, the *wine crop* or *vintage* of the season; and hence it is mostly coupled with wine and oil as a product of the land. That it was intoxicating is shewn by Hos. iv. 11." Yet Dr. Samson, with his accustomed virtue, dares to write: "Gesenius *hints* (!) that *tirosh* is derived from *yarash*, because it gets possession



of the brain—inebriates.” p. 73. If one man can be so abominably lying, why need a whole society abet this sinner against all truth? DR. LEE, late Regius Professor of Hebrew in Cambridge, says: “root *yarash*. *New wine*, so named, it is thought, from its *taking possession* of the mind.” So ABRAHAM TROMMIUS, giving as the definition, the Greek “*methusma*, potus inebrians,” intoxicating drink. This *methusma* is used by Theodotion, Aquila, and Symmachus to represent our “strong drink,” and by the Septuagint for *tirosh* in Hos. iv. 11. BAGSTER’S New English and Hebrew Lexicon gives the same derivation and meaning. And so BYTHNER and COCCEIUS. The SEPTUAGINT has *gleukos* (sweet wine), *methusma* (drunkenness), and *oinos* (wine), all for *tirosh*. ROBERTSON, formerly Professor of Oriental languages in the University of Edinburgh, derives it from the Arabic *turash*, “to be quick, to ferment.”

FUERST, a most learned Hebraist, adopts the usual derivation from *yarash* to *possess*, but with a different signification, “what is got from grapes or fruits;” *i.e.*, their product as our possession, not as possessing us. But of Fuerst, Dr. Robertson-Smith, the present Arabic professor at Oxford, says: “He proceeds on very faulty etymological principles, and must be used with great caution.” Now, both Fuerst and Gesenius refer us to the Syriac form of this same word, *meritho*, Gesenius also to the Chaldee form *mêrath*. They both really are the same word as *tirosh*; *m* being the initial formative in these languages, as *t* is in Hebrew; and *th* representing *sh*. Now I turn to BUXTORF’S Chaldee, Talmudic, and Rabbinic Lexicon, and I extract his account of

this word as used in the literature of the Jewish nation. "MERATH, *pure unmixed wine, sicera*," (i.e., strong drink.) After explaining its identity, as I had done above, before looking into him, he goes on: "It answers to the Hebrew *asis*, and sometimes to *shêchar*. Hence it is used in Joel i. 5, for *asis*, and also Isaiah xlix. 26. Add Amos ix. 13 and Joel v. 10. In Deut. xxix. 6, it stands for *shêchar*, strong drink, as also in Ps. lxix. 12, where "drunkards" are, as in the margin, "drinkers of strong drink." These explanations of Buxtorf, it is to be remembered, are from the earliest interpretations of the Hebrew Scriptures in the common speech of the people, and demonstrate incontestibly that they understood *tirosh* to be an intoxicating drink. And now for a little we really must hear Dr. Samson. On p. 70 he says: "The word *tirosh*, as all agree, is derived from the verb *yarash*. The primary meaning is to *seize* or *dispossess*." But, on p. 51, he makes it mean "cast up," in the sense of vomit, referring for his authority to Job xx. 15, and informs us that this "gives the first and clearest intimation of the distinction made by the Hebrews between two kinds of wine—the laxative and the intoxicating." Now, as they all repudiate the idea of our Lord's furnishing wine of the latter sort at Cana, see what they ask us to believe, viz., the Divine beneficence of a seven days'—but I cannot go on. Did I not well say that this stupid learning is enough to turn one's stomach!

SHECHAR, the "strong drink" of our English Bible, is most clearly an intoxicant; but teetotal learning thinks this "an inaccurate, a particularly unfortunate translation." So



Lees, Kerr, Samson, Patton—all Doctors. But *why*, I cannot even imagine, except that in Deut. xiv. 26 *Shechar* is expressly permitted to the use of God's people, and in a religious action—"before the Lord." As for Dr. Samson, his tangle of folly and learned ignorance is enough to make any one who attempts to undo it lose his wits ; and this stupidity might be tolerable if it were not for the stolid blasphemy, unrelieved by its usual accompaniment, passion. The very best that can be said of Dr. Samson is Churchill's line—

“Learned without sense, and venerably dull.”

The curse of the Eternal must and will rest on the authors of such a literature. But, I shall after a moment, leave their twaddle, and go to the pure fountain, the Bible itself. They would have *shechar*, following the lead of the *Temperance Commentary*, be nothing more than “sweet drink,” because the word is manifestly the same as our *sugar*! forgetting Max Müller's warning, that “sound etymology has nothing to do with sound!” On second thoughts, I will not go into this subject : it would be wholly superfluous. I shall content myself and my readers by giving St. Jerome's account of the word, and adding all the places where the word is used whether as verb or noun, by which all may satisfy themselves. “*Sicera* is, in the Hebrew tongue, every drink that can intoxicate, whether it be made from corn or the juice of fruits, or by boiling honey into a sweet and barbarian drink, or from dates, or from water thickened and coloured by the boiling of fruits.” I add, from Taylor's Hebrew Concordance, his definition of the verb, and the places where it occurs:—“*Inebriari*. To drink plentifully ; to have the spirits raised with drink ;

to be drunken. *Figuratively*, To be drunken with blood is to shed much. A nation is drunken, when it is infatuated, bereft of judgment, in a staggering condition (Jer. 51:7), unable to guide or support itself. The strongest sort of wine, Num. 28:7, or any other strong liquor. Isa. 29:9; 51:21; Hag. 1:6; Cant. 5:1; Jer. 25:27; Lam. 4:21; Nah. 3:11; Gen. 9:21; 43:34 (see margin): Isa. 49:26; Jer. 51:7; Hab. 2:15; Isa. 63:6; 2 Sam. 11:13; Jer. 51:39, 57; 48:26; Deut. 32:42; 1 Sam. 1:14; 25:36; 1 Kings 16:9; 20:16; Prov. 26:9; Isa. 19:14; Jer. 23:9; Job 12:25; Psal. 107:27; Isa. 24:20; Joel 1:15; Isa. 28:1, 3; 1 Sam. 1:13. Noun, *Potus inebrians*: Num. 6:3; Prov. 20:1; 31:4, 6; Isa. 5:11, 22; 24:9; 29:9; 56:12; Num. 28:7, where the English is "the strong wine"—[observe, "poured unto the Lord for a drink-offering;"] Ps. 69:12, margin; Lev. 10:9; Num. 6:3; Deut. 29:6; Judg. 13: 4, 7, 14; 1 Sam. 1:15; Isa. 28:7; Deut. 14:26; Mic. 2:11; Ezek. 23:33; 39:19." Let any one but turn up these places, and then decide whether the men who maintain *shêchar* to be but "sweet drink," as innocent as the French *eau sucré*, are cheats or lunatics. For my part I consider the vulgar drunkenness of the bar-room as saintliness compared with this deliberate lying in holy things.

KHEMER. Dr. Samson is as delightful here as elsewhere. Here is his account of the word. "The first and simplest artificial product is that called the 'blood' and 'the pure blood of the grapes' . . . the pure expressed juice of the grape (Gen. xl. 11) . . . 'thou didst drink the pure blood of the grape,' (Deut. xxxii. 14) . . . the *chemer* was manifestly a light wine. In the original Hebrew the noun is only twice found ;

rendered 'pure' before the expression 'blood of the grapes,' as above. Indeed I have observed that Temperance orators regard this verse as a very strong position. Inside it the teetotal sect grow jubilant. "Yes," they cry, and throw up their caps of prohibition, "that's it, let us have the pure juice of the grape"—so they prosaically turn "blood" into juice—"none of your diabolical fermented stuff!" But the Hebrew text is open to none of this ignorant misconception; and I suppose some at least will be surprised to learn what it really is. The order and meaning of the words are:— "And the blood of the grape thou didst drink—*Khemer*"; i. e., wine, from *Khamar*, to ferment. The Septuagint translates: "He drank the blood of the cluster—wine." Observe, in spite of Dr. Samson's emphasis on the words "pure," there is no separate word to which it corresponds in the Hebrew, and it will be seen that it makes dead against him. Our translators may seem open to blame for their version of the text; but a slight consideration shews how just they were, and at the same time how adverse to our new learning. The grape-juice, when duly fermented, becomes defecated, and not till then is it entitled to be called "pure," which we must conclude is intended to do duty for "purified," for on no other hypothesis can we account for the introduction of the English "pure," which has no verbal equivalent in the original. This shews the mind of our translators as to what wine is.\* So all authorities. Gesenius: "So called as being fermented." So Fuerst. Rosenmueller: "Pure wine, which has fermented, and has been purified by fermentation."

\*Months after this was written, I see the Revised Version justifies me: "And of the blood of the grape thou drankest wine."

Robertson, *Clavis Pentateuchi* : "Vinum merum, i. e., which has fermented, and which has by its fermentation been purified (defœcatum) . . . Pure, red wine." He adds a long and learned note in illustration, ending with "for *Khemer* seems to denote a better sort of wine in Isa. xxvii. 2." Psal. lxxv. 8, leaves no doubt as to the force of the word, and Dr. Samson's comment leaves no doubt as to his mental disorder. "For in the hand of the Lord there is a cup, and the wine is red, *Khamar* ; it is full of mixture ; and He poureth out of the same ; but the dregs, thereof, all the wicked of the earth shall wring them out, and drink them." The language is figurative. God holds a cup of strong, intoxicating wine ; and as drunkards mixed their wine with other more powerful intoxicants, spices, and drugs, Prov. xxiii. 30 ; so God mixes in His cup anger, and wrath, and woe, and calamity, and compels the wicked to drink down to the very dregs (lees), and the dregs themselves, this maddening draught. The necessary basis of this figurative language is the intoxicating character of the *Khemer*. *By all means let the reader look up the five references in the margin of the Bible, as an infallible commentary on this verse (Ps. lxxv. 8,) ere he reads another line.*

We can now appreciate Dr. Samson's sense and candour. He says : "The added phrase, 'it is full of mixture,' indicates the contrast between the fresh, effervescing, light wine *before* admixture, and its inflaming character *after* the admixture." As if one would take as the basis of an intended maddening draught the unintoxicating wine, instead of the very strongest ! Besides Proverbs as quoted, see also

Isa. v. 22. And yet *Khemer* is, in Moses's words, the very climax of the earthly blessing with which God had endowed His Israel !

SOVE. Of this Dr. Samson tells us, it was "wine diluted with water and then boiled, thus driving off in part the alcohol, and concentrating the nutritive qualities. The verb, meaning to drink luxuriously, is used to indicate *guzzling* drinkers, who are made heavy and stupid, rather than excited by its use," p. 66, 67. "Must boiled to half syrup," p. 414. Dr. Patton : "a luscious and probably boiled wine." Dr. Samson has no doubt about the boiling. Gesenius says, this is an onomatopoeic word, that is, formed from the sound, and it is the same as our "sup." Well, let the Bible explain its force, rather than Dr. Samson. In Deut. xxi. 20, "This our son is a glutton and a *drunkard*," SOVE. Same in Prov. xxiii. 21, Nahum i. 10, of the Ninevites, in the siege when they were overthrown : "while they be folden together as thorns, and while they are drunken as drunkards, they shall be devoured as stubble fully dry ;" i.e., as the translator of Gesenius explains, "marching in phalanx, and intoxicated to reeling." In this verse Fuerst also explains it, "to carouse immoderately."\* Yet Dr. N. Kerr is only "inclined to think" an intoxicant is referred to here, and Dr. Samson thinks they had only made themselves "heavy and stupid" by "guzzling" sweet syrup ! Profane history confutes the corrupters here ; for it informs us that

\*Revised Version : "Though they be like tangled thorns, and be drenched as it were in their drink, they shall be devoured utterly as dry stubble."

the king and nobles of Assyria were proverbial for their drunken habits, and Diodorus Siculus, Bk. ii. ch. 26, says that Nineveh was taken when the king and nobles were carousing in a drunken revel. Yet *sove* must be an innocent non-intoxicant ! but in spite of Dr. Samson, Isaiah represents it as a good thing : i. 22. This is his word : “ Thy wine is mingled with water.” I will copy Fuerst under the verb *mahal* : “ Only used fig. to cut wine, i.e., to weaken it by mixing water with it, to take from it the fiery and noble part, Isa. i. 22, comp. *vinum castrare* (Pliny H. N. 19, 19, 2) *jugulare Falernum* (Martial Ep. i. 28).” And so Delitzsch. What does Dr. Samson say to this ?

I have now gone through all the words in the Hebrew Bible which we ever translate “wine.” They all clearly represent drinks which had intoxicating properties, and which, however beneficial, were capable of being abused to man’s great injury.

2. I must next turn to the New Testament, which has no new or different information to give us, though not a little to confirm what we have already gathered from the Old. When we come to the Greek *oinos*, the same etymologically as our wine, the dictionaries recognize nothing but “the fermented juice.” And it is on the ground of its stimulating property that our Lord compares His Gospel, a new mighty stimulating power, to wine. The same passage, too, Luke v. 37-39, illustrates the quality of “good” wine : “No man having drunk old wine straightway desireth new ; for he saith, the old is better.” Apt is the comment furnished by Plutarch :

"The wine being made good, the more will be drunk, and the worse will be the drinkers." The Latin Columella informs us that almost all wine has the property of improving by age. I suppose we shall be told that syrups do. At any rate a milder syrup was not what the Jews understood by "old wine." Lightfoot, in his *Horæ Hebraicæ* on Luke i. 15, says, that the Jews regarded such wine and *sikera* as identical; and he himself adds, that they are so without doubt in Num. xxiii. 7; and in Luke v. 38, he shows they understood by "old wine" that which was three years old. Again, in that parable of more than man's charity, the parable of God's philanthropy, the Good Samaritan cleanses the bleeding wounds of humanity with his pungent, penetrating remedial grace, represented by wine, in its proper sense; for who can think of sweet syrup? We are sure of the meaning here, as Galen, the famous physician of antiquity, expressly mentions red or dark wine (*oinos melas*), which is always fermented, as proper to be used in such a case. Dr. P., however, holds that it was "a healing ointment made by the mixture of the two"!

I am almost afraid to mention the Miracle of Cana, as it is so vilely blasphemed by the teetotal rabble. Let us first hear Dr. Patton. He evolves the character of the wine out of his own inner consciousness, and he says: "It is pertinent to ask, is it not derogatory to the character of Christ and the teaching of the Bible to suppose that he exerted his miraculous power to produce at least sixty gallons of intoxicating wine?—wine which inspiration had denounced as a mocker, as biting like a serpent, and stinging like an adder, as the



poison of dragons, the cruel venom of asps, and which the Holy Ghost had selected as the emblem of the wrath of the Almighty? Is it probable that he gave *that* to the guests after they had used the wine provided by the host, and which, it is claimed, was intoxicating?" p. 89, 90. Thus three *assumptions* settle the matter. "It is derogatory to suppose"—"it is not probable"—"wine which inspiration had denounced," &c. Q. E. D. Dr. P. next claims St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, Dr. Hall the Bishop of Norwich, and "the critical Dr. Trench, now Archbishop of Dublin," (resigned December, 1884), as holding that the wine made was the same as the juice in the grape. It is true they all compare the instantaneous action of the miracle with the gradual natural processes which issue in "the nobler juices" of the grape. But it is unpardonably false to represent these authors as holding that the water was not turned into "wine" proper, that is, intoxicating. First, *St. Augustine*, on this very place: "Read all the prophetic books; and if Christ be not understood therein, what canst thou find so insipid and silly? Understand Christ in them, and what thou readest not only has a taste, but even *inebriates* thee; transporting the mind from the body, so that forgetting the things that are past, thou reachest forth to the things that are before." Tract. ix. sect. 3. Again, in sect. 5, speaking of our Lord's "opening the Scriptures" to the two disciples, he says: "Thus our Lord Jesus Christ changed the water into wine, and that has now taste which before had not, *that now inebriates which before did not.*" That is enough from St. Augustine, though I shall have a good deal to say of this use of the word "inebriate."



*St. Chrysostom* says, that the thing made was "not simply wine, but the best wine," from which he takes occasion to inveigh against excess, and urges that "a poor and plain table is the mother of health." But to conclude that he was of the mind of the Temperance doctors, because he does not expressly say that this wine was inebriating is such a piece of folly as cannot easily be equalled, because it is so easily confuted. In his first Homily on the Statues, he says, of "those simple ones among our brethren, who, when they see any persons disgracing themselves with drunkenness, instead of reproving such, blame the fruit given them by God, and say, 'Let there be no wine.' We should say, then, in answer to such, 'Let there be no drunkenness;' for wine is the work of God, but drunkenness is the work of the devil. Wine maketh not drunkenness, but intemperance produceth it. Do not accuse that which is the workmanship of God, but accuse the madness of a fellow-mortal." Again, in Hom. xi. in Ep. ad Rom., with evident reference to John ii. 10, "Every man, at the beginning, doth set forth good wine; and when men have well drunk (R. V. drunk freely), then that which is worse; but thou hast kept the good wine until now." *St. Chrysostom* says: "For the drunken man knows not how great the abominableness of bad wine; but the sober man knows this to a nicety." While I am here, let me note that Dr. Samson claims Cocceius, the famous Dutch divine, for his side. "In commenting on John ii. 10, Cocceius remarks:" and then gives a long passage which purports to be from his commentary. But the *only* words there are, *Laudat Vinum, simulque miratur consilium sponsi, qui tam bonum vinum servaverit ad extremum.* That's all!

“He praises the wine, and at the same time expresses his surprise at the policy of the bridegroom who had kept such good wine to the last.” Nor have I been able to find anywhere in Cocceius the words attributed to him. But, of course, *twelve folios* are nothing to “the explorer of the folios of universal Christian literature?” One can hide a good deal of ignorance and dishonesty in referring to half a dozen lines supposed to be somewhere within the compass of twelve folios.

*Dr. Joseph Hall, Bishop of Norwich.* In the days of the good bishop, 1574-1656, no one dreamt of this craze, and in his admirable *Contemplations* it is only by inference that we should expect to find any statement of the intoxicating property of wine. Here are some sentences on the marriage in Cana: “There was wine enough for a meal, though not for a feast; and if there were not wine enough, there was enough water; yet the Holy Virgin complains of the want of wine, and is troubled with the very lack of superfluity. The bounty of our God reaches not to our life only, but to our contentment: neither hath He thought good to allow us only the bread of sufficiency, but sometimes of pleasure. . . It is a scrupulous injustice (*i.e.*, an injurious scrupulosity) to scant ourselves, where God hath been liberal. . . The munificent hand of God regards not our need only, but our honest (respectable) affluence. It is our sin and our shame, if we turn his favour into wantonness. . . That liberality hated to provide crab-wine for his guests.” But in his contemplation on Sampson, his opposition to Dr. Samson is not doubtful:—“A drunken Nazarite is a

monster among men. *We have now more scope than the ancient*: not drinking of wine, but drunkenness with wine is forbidden to the Evangelical Nazarite: wine, wherein is excess. Oh that ever Christians should *quench the Spirit of God with a liquor of God's own making*; that they should suffer their hearts to be drowned with wine, and should so live, as if the practice of the Gospel were quite contrary to the rule of the law." But claiming "the critical" Archbishop Trench certainly caps the climax. Here are his words:—"Of a piece with this is their *miserable objection*, who find the miracle incredible, [see the words of Dr. Patton, p. 89-93], since, if the Lord did not actually minister to an excess already commenced, yet, by the creation of so large and perilous a quantity of wine (for the quantity *was* enormous), he should have put temptations in men's way; *as though the secret of temptation lay in the scanty supply, and not in the strong self-restraint!*...But man is to be perfected, not by being kept out of temptation, but rather by being victorious in temptation." Among his many notes, he has this from St. Augustine, "the Lord not merely made wine, but, he adds, (De Gen. ad Lit. 1, 6, c. 13) *tale vinum, quod ebrius etiam conviva laudaret*,"—"such wine as even a *drunken* guest could praise;" making the ruler of the feast himself to have 'well drunk'"! He also quotes Calvin as answering "excellently well" the objection above made. I translate: "If His kindness is the incitement to excess, it comes to pass through our fault: but this rather is the true test of our temperance, if, in the midst of affluence, we are moderate and sparing."

I think, after these exposures, my readers are beginning to feel, and most justly, that the penitentiary is as likely to furnish us with examples of virtue as the Temperance Publication Society.

*Eph.* v. 18 is enough, one might suppose, to overthrow the Bible Temperance theory: "Be not drunk with wine, wherein is riot" (Revised Version). It is not the use of wine that is forbidden, but the being drunken with it. It is absolutely clear that the wine meant was intoxicating, and if the use of such were contemplated as unlawful the command should have been, "Drink no wine." But Dr. Samson holds that "wherein" refers only to the word "wine," p. 176; and that by these words St. Paul "had enjoined abstinence on the church of which he had been pastor." p. 454. Were this so, the words "be not drunken" would be simply absurd—they would be utterly inapplicable. If the wine itself were the evil thing, and not the drunkenness, "Do not drink" was the proper charge. Dr. S.'s grammar is as absurd as the rest of his trumpery learning. He assures us that Jerome understood it as he does, and that he "states that Paul declares that the use of wine is in itself the road to hopeless abandonment in a Christian." The best thing I can do is to let Jerome speak for himself. Here is his comment: "As we cannot serve two masters, God and Mammon, neither can we at the same time be *filled* with the Spirit and with wine: for he who is *filled* with the Spirit has prudence and gentleness, modesty and chastity; but he who is filled with wine has folly and fury, frowardness and lust; all which I judge to be expressed in one word by '*luxuria*.' If certain persons had

understood this they would never have charged me with rashness and heresy, because I said that if virginity were to be kept, wine must be declined by *young people*, and oil must not be cast upon the flame, nor the natural heat of the flesh be increased by the incitements of pleasure. But it may be (*potest*, is possible) it is the wine in which is the dissoluteness, and that is understood of which it is said in the Song of Moses, Deut. xxxii. 32, 33: 'Their wine is the fury of dragons, and the fury of asps that cannot be healed' (according to Jerome's Latin): for all who are drunken with the thoughts of this world, drink and are mad, and vomit, and fall headlong; and as in the fable of the Lapithæ and the Centaurs, rush to mutual destruction. To this wine that is opposed which the Lord has promised to drink with us in His kingdom."

The place for which St. Jerome was blamed is in Ep. xxii., *de virginitate servanda*: "This I first of all say, with warning and urgency, that the spouse of Christ must flee wine as poison: these are the first arms of the demons against *youth*," &c. The italicised words make qualifications out of harmony with Dr. Samson's views, and it is plain that Jerome's vehemently ascetic language awakened some fears in the minds of soberer people. We shall see more of him later on.

But the Greek Fathers knew the grammar of their own speech as well as Dr. S., and they differ from him; as Origen, in Ellicott's Commentary; Clemens Alexandrinus, "the unsaveableness of drunkenness," as he understands it; with which compare these other words of his: Pæd. ii. 2.

“Drunkenness is the excessive use of wine ;” Theophylact’s explanation is : “That is, the immoderate use ;” and so Theodore and Chrysostom. In “the master work of Poole,” as Dr. Samson calls the *Synopsis Criticorum*, I count *eight* learned post-reformation divines taking the same view ; and of English divines I find Bishop Ellicott, Dean Alford, Bishop Hall, and the learned Henry Hammond, going in the same track. I translate a few words from Calvin : “When he forbids us to be inebriated, he prohibits all abundant and immoderate potations. Just as if he said, Be not intemperate in drink.” The acute and spiritual Bengel has : “*In which wine*, that is, as far as it is drunk immoderately.” Dr. Patton says : “In this place *oinos* most probably (!) designates an intoxicating liquor.” What is the use of wasting common sense on people of that sort ! This is far worse drunkenness than any saloon can produce. Only note, that Doctors Samson and Patton confute each other.

*Acts* ii. 13. In thirteen pages scattered through his book does Dr. S. turn again and again to this text with some new or the same device of perversion. Both the mockers and the Apostle Peter recognized the intoxicating power of *gleukos*, “new wine,” or else the mockery and the refutation were alike witless. I do not quote Dr. P., just because he is absolutely unintelligible. Dr. N. Kerr has the grace to say : “Of all the explanations none is satisfactory to my mind.” I suppose because they all recognize the fact that *gleukos* is an intoxicant, and the admission would spoil the symmetry of the doctor’s theory.



But I must not pass from this place without noticing a testimony against them worth a ship-load of their rubbishy learning. The Syriac Peshito, the oldest version of the New Testament, exhibiting equal familiarity with Greek and Syriac, and made almost in the home of the sacred writers, turns *gleukos* by *meritho*, for which see what I have already noted, and it adds an explanatory clause, the whole thus rendered by the Wesleyan Etheridge: "But others mocked them, saying, These men have drunk new wine, *and are inebriate.*"

There are two other places in the New Testament which demand special attention. I will take first that which can be more briefly despatched.

1 Cor. xi. 21. Rebuking the disorders of the Corinthian *Agapè*, the Apostle says: "One is hungry and another is drunken." In four several pages, 149, 151, 162, 175, Dr. Samson endeavours to escape the adverse inferences which are inevitably drawn from this narrative, viz, that intoxicating wine was customarily used, and even when grossly abused was not forbidden, and that, too, in a sacred rite. His one means of escape is that the Greek word properly means "surfeit or fullness," not drunkenness. Dr. Patton says the same, Dr. Kerr says the same, and the Temperance Commentary, which they obediently follow, had before them said the same. It is utterly groundless, and no number of repetitions could make it a whit more plausible. *Fullness* is, of course, a secondary meaning of drunkenness, as the latter word implies the former, but not *vice versa*.

Nothing but desperation could drive men to this contradiction of all authorities. But, they argue, the proper antithesis to "hungry" is "full," and not drunken. Dr. Kerr claims Chrysostom and Bengel for this view. St. Chrysostom expressly denies this interpretation. He says: "They had passed into gluttony and drunkenness: wherefore he did not say, one is hungry and the other is full, *korennutai*, but *methuei*, drunken." And the modern Bengel says, "*Ebrius est*." What sort of honesty or Christianity is Dr. K.'s? Lightfoot thinks that the Corinthian carouse is to be explained by the customary excesses of the Passover.

This brings me to the last place I shall devote any space to.

In *Luke* xxii. 18 our Lord speaks of the Passover wine as "the fruit of the vine." Fifteen times from first to last does Dr. S. refer to this as decisive for his assumption; and so say they all. Dr. S. says: "The natural meaning, of course, is, that it is the fresh product of the grape," p. 159. The Temperance Commentary says: "Unfermented wine is, in literal truth, and beyond all question, the only fruit of the vine." N. Kerr, M. D., says: "Unfermented grape juice can truly be called the fruit of the vine; but, after fermentation, the nature of the liquid is completely changed." Now, I ask, on the contrary, does not any man with the least wit see that "the fruit of the vine" does not stand for "grape-juice" either "naturally" or "literally?" that the natural and literal fruit of the vine is grapes, not grape-juice? Do we call cider the fruit of the apple tree? Hence, reasonable people would enquire after some other meaning for the unusual expression, for such it was. Now let me



inform this tribe that "the fruit of the vine" was the exact *technical term* for fermented wine in the liturgical use of the Jews. In the *Mishna*, an oral tradition current in our Lord's day, we read (*de Benedictionibus*, cap 6, pt. i., p. 20, Surenhusius): "How do they bless for fruits? For fruits of a tree they say, *Thou who createst the fruits of the tree*; except for wine (*Khûts min hayyayin*), as for wine they say, *Thou who createst the fruit of the vine*." It is not then, most clearly, the natural and literal fruit of the vine that is meant by the phrase. This was the religious phrase; and our Lord on other occasions used the common term, wine. This testimony is irrefutable. But it is to be further noted that the use of wine formed no part of the original Passover institution, and so the Jewish reason assigned for its introduction will assist here. Lightfoot gives it out of the Talmud, in his *Horæ Hebraicæ*, in Matt. xxvii. 27; "A man must cheer up his wife and children to make them rejoice at the festival. And what do they cheer them up withal? With wine." Again, in the Passover feast the cup was mixed, and the reason expressly assigned for it in the Babylonian Talmud is, that the wine was "very strong;" and, as the Jerusalem Gemara states, (Lightfoot, as above), to prevent the feasters becoming drunk. Comment is superfluous. But I will add some further testimony of a different sort to show that the Passover wine was inebriating. Red wine, *yayin edom*, was distinctly prescribed in both the Jerusalem and Babylonian Talmuds, as may be seen in Lightfoot. This red wine is the blood of the grape; but no unfermented wine is red, not even that made from the juice of the purple grape. The reason is given in Miller's Chemistry. The colouring matter is in

the husks, and can be extracted only by alcohol and acid, or wine. "Red grapes may be made to yield a white wine, if the husks of the grape be removed from the must before fermentation begins. \* \* But if the skins be left in the fermenting mass, the alcohol, as it is formed, dissolves the colouring matter, producing the different shades of red wine." The Jews, later on, thought it prudent to exchange this red wine for white, in order to remove all pretext for the charge that they drank Christians' blood at the Passover. But it is asserted with endless iteration, and the most undoubting confidence by Dr. Samson, *et hoc genus omne*, that the Jews did not, and do not use fermented grape-juice in the Paschal rites. Now, in the *Presbyterian Review* for January, 1882, no less than ten most learned witnesses are adduced to the contrary. Of the ten I will quote but one, as he is the most renowned, and his words are the briefest. Dr. Delitzsch, of Leipzig, is surpassed by no one in his knowledge of Jewish literature. His words are: "The wine of the Passover has at all times been fermented wine, which, according to the prevalent custom, was mixed with water." I shall content myself and, I hope, my readers, with one other testimony, that of the learned Dr. Alfred Edersheim, a converted Israelite, now vicar of Loders, the late Warburtonian lecturer, and the author of the late "Life of Christ," on the author of which the general verdict has been, "steeped to the lips in Jewish lore." In a letter\* to the Oxford professor, Dr. Bright, dated 15th September, 1882, he says:

"The wine used at the Paschal Supper was un-

\*In the *London Guardian*.

doubtedly fermented and intoxicating. In point of fact it *did* intoxicate. A number of instances are related in *Jer. Pes.* p. 37c, &c., in which certain Rabbis (who are named) suffered in consequence.

“In that part of the Talmud we have exact *data* about the amount of wine in the four cups; its kinds, colour, and mixture, and even about the size of the cups.

“Again, in *Jer Pesach* p. 37d, line 23 from the bottom, the direction of the Mishna (*Pes. x. 6*) to the effect that it was lawful to drink between the first and second, but not between the third and fourth Paschal cups, is explained. ‘This for fear of becoming drunk’; it being added that such was not to be apprehended in regard to drinking, between the first and second cup, since the wine which was drunk while people ate rarely intoxicated, but it was otherwise with wine drunk after food.

“Similarly, in the passage previously referred to (p. 37 col. c.) it is stated that the cup need not be emptied at one draught, as this might more easily intoxicate; and that, to avoid it, each cup might be emptied in several draughts. In fact, to *avoid* intoxication, the Paschal wine was almost always ‘mixed’ (as it was the common custom in drinking wine), the ordinary proportion being two parts of water to one of wine. But this does not seem to have been the uniform proportion; and strong wine was mixed in that of three parts of water to one of wine. This mixing was called *mesiga*, and the mixed wine *mæseg*. In the *Jer.*

Talmud (Pesach 37c), this mixture is repeatedly referred to in connection with the Paschal cups. And finally, to prove this practice in the *Mishnah* (Pes. vii. 13), it is directed that if two companies eat (the Paschal Supper) in the same place, the one turns its face to the one side, the other to the other, ‘*and the kettle*’ (for mixing the wine with water) ‘stands between them.’

“Still further, to show that the natural fermentation of wine could not possibly be ranked with *leaven*, the principle is distinctly laid down in the Talmud (Pes. 40 a, line 8 from top) that ‘the juice of fruits does not produce leavening. In the *Mishnah* (Pes. iii. 1) among the things by which the Paschal regulations are infringed is mentioned *Chometz haædomi* ‘edomite vinegar,’ which seems to have been a kind of wine in which fermentation was produced (or increased) by putting in barley; and this seems at one time to have been done with some sorts of wine in Judea (see Pes. 42 b, line 7, &c., from the top): and *such* wine, but *not* that by natural fermentation, would, of course, be interdicted.

“Mr. Caine quotes a Mr. Frey. [So does Dr. Samson.] All I can say is, that the words which he italicises are a specimen of the usual mode of covering an inaccuracy by boldness of assertion...I hope I have sufficiently established that wine used at the Paschal Supper, and during the week, was the ordinary fermented and intoxicating wine.”

This is superabundant witness, and it particularly disposes of that palmary argument of the ignorant, that as leaven was forbidden, so fermented liquor must have been. The leaven

or ferment was understood by the Jews to be confined to grain, and not to extend to fruits.\* With one invincible

\*Dr. Samson quotes (248) Rev. Eli Smith as saying : "In 1835 I called on the chief Rabbi of the Spanish Jews in Hebron, during the passover week, and was treated with unleavened bread and wine." "When asked how this was consistent with abstinence from all ferment, the Rabbi replied, that "the vinous ferment had passed, and no sign of acetous ferment had appeared ; otherwise it would be rejected." This, I believe, was a quite unnecessary, though ingenious, reply of the Rabbi's, as must be inferred from the authorities already presented ; but curiously enough it exactly coincides with an English medical man's explanation of the allowance of wine. Dr. Spencer Thomson, an author of repute in medicine, argues in a discourse on Temperance and total abstinence, that "the wine used by our Lord at the institution of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper *must* have been fermented wine, and settling that, would, with many at least, settle the question of the lawfulness of the proper use of wine \* \* Now the leaven-containing bread being thus interdicted, nay the presence of leaven in any form, we must expect the rule or principle to extend to the wine used at the passover as well as to other things ; [we have seen he is mistaken here] ; but to use unfermented wine would be to use what certainly contains leaven in abundance, whether that wine be fresh or boiled. It is only the properly fermented wine, the "good wine," that is free from leaven \* \* Fermentation, then, is an orderly process, fitted to transform the thick, leaven-containing destructible grape-juice, into the clear, aromatic, alcoholic, and, therefore, self-preserving wine, freed, if properly prepared, from the forbidden leaven, for whatever reason forbidden. I ask which would be the wine most likely, nay certain, to be used at the Passover Feast by our Lord, the *leaven-containing* non-alcoholic grape-juice, however prepared, or the *true wine*, drawn off from the impurities, the "lees," it had deposited in its process of purification ? I leave reason and common sense to answer the question." The difficulty is unreal ; but as it is the extravagants who raised it, it is beautiful to see them "hoist with their own petard."

witness on this head, I shall dismiss it. In the famous Passover sauce called *Kharoseth*, used ever since the Babylonian Captivity, vinegar was one of the prescribed ingredients. Buxtorf, in his Talmudical Lexicon, after enumerating them, says, “*ea acetoque perfundebant*”—vinegar was poured over all.

I have now gone over all the principal points of the Temperance Bible's Scripture argument, and let any honest and intelligent reader judge if every contention of its dupes has not been superabundantly confuted.

---

## CHAPTER III.

### THE WITNESS OF CHRISTIAN HISTORY MISREPRESENTED

“I remember the days of old.”—*Psalm* cxliii. 5.

Quite in accord with the unfounded assumptions respecting the Holy Scriptures which I have had so wearisomely to examine, is the monstrous folly of claiming the greatest names of early Christianity as prohibitionists, that is, as decrying any use of intoxicating wine. I shall follow Dr. S.’s order. He begins with

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, near the end of the second century. Dr. S. expatiates on his fame and learning very justly, and ends by saying that Clement’s “comments are especially confirmatory of the fact that intoxicating wine was not used by Christ, or introduced at the Lord’s Supper in the early church,” p. 202. Space will not be wasted in letting Clement speak for himself. In the *Pædagogus*, lib. ii., c. 2, he begins by noticing the Apostle’s prescription to Timothy, “a little, that he might know it to be a remedy which, should he drink to excess, would need another remedy.” He next points out the spiritual significance of “the mixture” in the Eucharist, and then goes on: “I therefore greatly admire those who have adopted an austere life, and who desire only water, the medicine of temperance, and flee wine as far as possible, as they would the danger of fire. I judge, therefore, that youths and maidens should for the most part abstain



from this medicine," as injurious to that hot age. He then describes in language too plain to be translated the evil results of drinking in the young, observing that "this, the *gleukos* (new wine) of youth (*i. e.* the intoxication of animal spirits) transgresses the bounds of modesty." Again: "Those who are in the flower of youth and dine in the daytime, having a suitable meal, should totally abstain from wine"—for physiological reasons that would not now be appreciated. "And if there be thirst, let it not be relieved by much water"—so that St. Clemens could apply his temperance lessons to iced-water and the non-alcoholic drinks now so much in vogue. "But towards evening, about supper time, wine may be used, when we are no longer engaged in more serious readings. Then also the air becomes colder than it is during the day, so that the failing natural warmth requires to be nourished by the introduction of heat. But even then it must be only a little wine that is to be used; for we must not go on to intemperate potations. Those who are already advanced in life may partake more hilariously (*hilaroteron*) of the bowl to warm by the *harmless* medicine of the vine the chill of age." Again: "It is best to mix the wine with as much water as possible, and not to have recourse to it as to water, and so get enervated to drunkenness, and not pour it in as water from love of wine. *For both are works of God*, and on that account the mixture of the two, water and wine, conduces to health." Again: "With reason, therefore, the Apostle enjoins, 'Be not drunk with wine, wherein is much *asotia*,' intimating by this word the inconsistency of drunkenness with salvation. *For if he made wine at the marriage, he did not give per-*

*mission to get drunk.*" One more quotation: "In what manner do you think the Lord drank when he became man for our sakes? As shamelessly as we? Was it not with decorum and propriety? Was it not deliberately? For, rest assured, He Himself also partook of wine, for he, too, was man. And He blessed the wine, saying, 'Take, drink; this is my blood'—the blood of the vine. He figuratively calls the Word 'shed for many for the remission of sins'—the holy stream of gladness. And that he who drinks ought to observe moderation, He clearly showed by what He taught at feasts; for he did not teach affected by wine. And that it was wine which was the thing blessed, He showed again, when He said to His disciples, 'I will not drink of the fruit of this vine, till I drink it with you in the kingdom of My Father.' But that it was wine which was drunk by the Lord, He tells us again, when He spake concerning Himself, reproaching the Jews for their hardness of heart. 'For the Son of Man,' He says, 'came, and they say, Behold a glutton and a wine bibber, a friend of publicans.' *Let this be held fast by us against those who are called Encratites,*" (i. e.) Temperance men. The sentences italicized will show how perfectly shocking is Dr. S.'s misrepresentation.

TERTULLIAN, a contemporary of Clement, is passed over by Dr. S.; but a sentence from his Apology, or Defence of the Christians against the heathen, deserves to be quoted. Describing the Agapæ, or meals in connexion with the Eucharist, he says "they drank as much as was useful for modest men;" and when the meal was over "each one is summoned to come forward, and sing to God as he is able

from the Scriptures, or from his own mind. Hence proof is afforded how he has been drinking."

CYPRIAN, Bishop of Carthage, A.D. 250, and Martyr, is next claimed. Dr. S. says "he argued at length for the use of wine diluted largely with water at the Lord's Supper." That is, Cyprian is represented as contending for water. I am not obliged to determine how much of this is mere stupidity, and how much perversity. The fact is this: Some had celebrated the Eucharist in water alone, and Cyprian writes a treatise against it in the form of a letter to a brother bishop, Cæcilius. After many arguments, showing that the mixed cup should be used, he says: "Whence it appears that the blood of Christ is not offered if there be no wine in the cup. But how shall we drink the new wine of the fruit of the vine with Christ in the kingdom of His Father, if in the sacrifice of God the Father and of Christ we do not offer wine, nor mix the cup of the Lord by the Lord's own tradition? The Holy Spirit also is not silent in the Psalms on the sacrament of this thing, when He makes mention of the Lord's cup, and says, 'Thy intoxicating cup, how excellent it is?' Now the cup which intoxicates is assuredly mingled with wine, for water cannot intoxicate anybody." Later on I shall continue this quotation, and let him declare what he means by this inebriation. I only say now that Dr. S.'s *suggestio falsi* is without a *particle* of foundation. His "largely" is a large falsehood; and, if he were not a moral pachyderm, he would not allow his printed sink of lies to circulate.

ORIGEN (230) follows Clement in Dr. S. But why he refers to this famous man at all is not easily conjectured, unless as a provocative to more excessive falsehood. Dr. S. says he "is equally explicit" as Clement: which is true, but not in the sense intended. "He asserts that Noah did not, and could not, beforehand, know the intoxicating influence of wine, as is proved by the word 'began to be a husband-man.' He dwells on the fact that as in the case of the forbidden tree, only *experience* reveals the fact that 'wine takes away the mind.'" In this part of Origen's labours we have but a few fragmentary sentences; and on Noah's drunkenness but six lines altogether in Lommatzsch's 18 mo. edition. Here they are: "Noah knew not the nature of the wine, because he gets drunk; and the Scripture bears witness of this in saying. He began, and was naked.... Earthly wine divests (*gumnoi*, makes naked) the mind of the knowledge of spiritual things.... Such was the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, as the wine which made Noah naked." What is there *explicit* in this for Dr. S.'s dream? Where is the *could not*? What is said about *experience*, much less *dwelling on* it? But, in Ep. ad Rom. Com. lib. x. 3, he quietly maintains the Apostle's view of the indifference to a Christian of meats and drinks, and that it is only our end and aim that gives a moral meaning to our using or not using them, and that "we must drink, if by this our brother is to be furthered in the faith,"—et bibendum est, si per hoc proficit frater ad fidem. (We have only the Latin of Rufinus here.)

IRENÆUS (177) would have been far better omitted by

Dr. S., as he contributes nothing to his book but another occasion for misrepresentation. His "mingled cup," the custom of the whole church in the Eucharist from the very beginning, is explained by Dr. S., as arising from the "acidity" of the grapes of southern Gaul, "which were prepared with less care to prevent alcoholic fermentation!" So much space far worse than wasted. Incidentally, however, Irenæus shows himself of different mind to Dr. S.; for expounding the parable of the vineyard in Matt. xxi. he makes the words, "he digged a wine-press" mean "he prepared a receptacle for the prophetic Spirit," and later on showing the fulfilment of the parabolic prediction in the spread of the Church among the Gentiles, he says: "Everywhere are those who receive the Spirit." (Edit Massuet, p. 278). It is clear that he regarded wine as a *spirituous* liquor, and so a type of the quickening Spirit of God, remembering probably also the prophetic intoxication suggested by the words of the O. T., "this mad fellow," irreverently said of a son of the prophets.

JUSTIN MARTYR (140) appears to get two pages, but nothing comes of it, save that on his authority we are told there were Christian ascetics who abstained from flesh and wine; and Dr. S. turns aside to speak of

EUSEBIUS (260-340). The subject of B. xii. c. 25 of his *Præparatio Evangelica* is that "the drinking of wine should not be allowed to all." He quotes Plato who would exclude slaves from the use of wine, and would interdict others at certain times. He thinks that Moses anticipated Plato, in

Lev. x. 8, 9, and Num. vi. 2, 3 ; and he quotes Prov. xxxi. 4, 5, according to the Septuagint, which reads thus : “ With counsel do all things. With counsel drink wine. Rulers are passionate ; let them not drink wine lest ” &c. He takes St. Paul’s advice to Timothy, 1 Ep. v. 23, as an example. Out of his Ecclesiastical History, however, I present a narrative which he calls “ worthy of remembrance.” It relates to the confessors in the dreadful persecution at Vienne, Irenæus being then a Presbyter there. Here it is : “ One Alcibiades who was of their number, lived in an utterly sordid fashion, and previous to this hardly partook of any food at all, using only bread and water. But on his attempting to live in prison in the same way, it was revealed to Attalus, after he had passed through his first conflict in the amphitheatre, that Alcibiades would not do well in not using the creatures of God, and in leaving a pattern of offence to others. Alcibiades was persuaded, and partook of all things without fear, and gave thanks to God.” (Bk. v. c. 3).

LACTANTIUS (320) appears next in Dr. S.’s list, for no reason but because he quotes Virgil, and Dr. S. finds much about wine in Virgil—not to his purpose. And then

EPIPHANIUS (320-404), only because he mentions various Abstinence sects, who refused wine, flesh, and marriage ; and especially wine in the Eucharist. He mentions them but to condemn them.

ATHANASIUS (325), “ like Eusebius, urged entire abstinence from intoxicants as temperance.” But no proof is given of

this save the very queer one: "Orat. ad Gent. i. c. 34. Some Egyptians, indeed, pour out wine in their libations to their gods, but others only water!"

JEROME (b. 346) is the great authority of Dr. S., and we have observed before the amount of support derived from him. But Dr. S. refers us on p. 216 to *Ambrose* (de Sacram. l. iv.), *Chrysostom* (347-467) (Hom. in Matt. 83), and *Augustine* (de Doctrina Christ. iv. ch. 21), who "all accorded in commending the use of unintoxicating wine at the Lord's Supper." I do not possess the complete works of Ambrose, but from what I know of him through such treatises of his as I have read, I am very sure he is misrepresented. But I can say this confidently of St. Augustine. In the chapter referred to he gives examples of three styles of oratory, the *subdued*, the *temperate*, and the *majestic*. His examples are taken from Ambrose and Cyprian, and he has absolutely nothing of his own beyond the necessary words of introduction in each case. One of his examples is from the Epistle of Cyprian to Cæcilius which we have before quoted from; and Augustine's only words about it are: "In this book (letter) he resolves the question whether the cup of the Lord ought to contain water only, or water mingled with wine." What are they to say to this?

We are referred to St. Chrysostom's 83 Hom. on St. Matthew. Very well; I translate from his observations on xxvi. 29. "But why after His resurrection did He not drink water but wine? To pluck up by the roots another mischievous heresy; since there are certain that use water



in the mysteries, and He meant to indicate that when He delivered the mysteries He delivered wine ; and when He had risen He prepared, apart from the mysteries, a plain poor table, using wine, which He calls the fruit of the vine. Now the vine produces wine and not water. *And having sung an hymn they went out to the mount of Olives.* Let all those hear who, when they have eaten like swine, just kick over their table, and rise up drunken ; when they ought to give thanks, and end with a hymn." Note especially what I have quoted before from his first Homily on the Statutes. I will add a few words from his 19th Hom. on Ephes. v. 18. "And immoderateness in this makes men wrathful, &c. . . Wine was given for cheerfulness, not for drunkenness. . . Do you wish to learn where wine is excellent ? Hear the Scripture saying, 'Give wine to the sorrowful, and strong drink to those in pain.' With good reason, for it has power to soften what is rough and sad, and to banish what is gloomy. 'Wine maketh glad the heart of man.' How then does drunkenness spring from wine ? for this thing cannot work contradictory effects. Drunkenness is not then from wine, but from immoderateness."

Dr. Samson's wild work with the Fathers here comes to an end ; and I will end this chapter with a line from *Prudentius*, a Christian poet of the fourth century. Of the miracle at Cana he writes : "*Cantharis infusa lympa fit Falernum nobile*"—The water poured into the pots becomes noble Falernian wine.

Thus we see there is no particle of ground in Christian

antiquity for this Temperance delusion ; and we have seen at the same time how base and unprincipled are the methods by which it is sought to impose it on the understandings of the unlearned.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE WITNESS OF FACT CRYSTALLIZED IN CHRISTIAN PHRASE.

“Et Calix meus inebrians quam præclarus est !”

—*Psalm xxii. 5, Vulgate.*

“Et Poculum Tuum inebrians quam præclarum est !”

—*The Older Latin Version.*

I come now to an argument where I shall have no tortuosities to track, no perversities to chastise—just because it has never been touched by Temperance fanatics. It could not be through ignorance, but because *it could not be twisted* into any support for their delusion, and it is an invincible objection to its claims. In the Church of the first centuries there prevailed in her devotional language the custom of representing the higher forms of spiritual joy and exaltation as *inebriation*, and especially in connection with the Eucharistic cup. If the fact be established, the evidence is inevitable that that cup was literally inebriating, and, as such, furnished the ground of this so-called figurative language. Though this is alien to our modern matter-of-factness, and especially to our Western coldness, it is not mere fancifulness, but has its roots deep in nature and truth. Hence in Scripture everything in the natural world has its counterpart, or, more strictly, its antitype, in the spiritual ; as, for example, morning, night ; sleeping, awakening ; life, death ; home, exile ; wind, water, earth, bread, corn, wine, oil. The Ger-

man Luthardt well says : " It is not mere comparison ; but the spiritual is the true and the real. What is earthly is only a type. The name belongs truly and exactly to what is spiritual. The earthly thing corresponds to the name only inexactly and in an incomplete manner." And so Mrs. Browning, in *Aurora Leigh* :

" A two-fold world  
Must go to make a perfect cosmos. Natural things  
And spiritual."

The " two-fold man," she says, " fixes still  
The type with mortal vision, to pierce through,  
With eyes immortal, to the antitype  
Some call the ideal—*better called the real*,  
And certain to be called so presently,  
When things shall have their names."

What has been above quoted from Cyprian is a very clear example of the religious use of the word *inebriate*, and a sufficient explanation of the grounds of that use. It is to be observed too, that this use is taken directly from Scripture, as in the xxiii Psalm. Nor let the old Latin, whether Jerome's or the Old, be thought absurd. The Septuagint is, " and thy cup is inebriating as the best wine ;" and the Syriac, as translated in the Hebrew Student, renders " my cup intoxicating even as ardent wine."

The gladdening effect of wine whenever spoken of in scripture, they interpreted of spiritual and eucharistic joy: as Ps. civ. 15, " wine that maketh glad the heart of man ;" Eccles. ix. 7, " Eat thy bread with joy, and drink thy wine with a

merry heart ;" Cant. ii. 5. " He brought me to the banqueting house," Marg. " house of wine ;" v. 2. " I have drunk my wine with my milk : eat, O friends, drink, yea, drink abundantly, O beloved," Marg. " and be drunken ;" Zech. ix. 15, " They shall drink, and make a noise as through wine ; and they shall be filled like (Heb. the) bowls, and as the corners of the altar," plainly a sacred comparison, as it is a prediction of Christ's blessings ; Psal. xxxvi. 8, " They shall be abundantly satisfied with the fatness of Thy house," Vu'g. " inebriabuntur ;" Septuagint, *methusthesontai*, shall be made drunken ; Syriac, *nerwun*, the same ; and who can tell what high meaning our Lord intended by the words, " I will drink no more of this fruit of the vine, until I drink it new with you in the Kingdom of My Father?" With such a ground in Scripture we need not be surprised at the phraseology which arose in the Church ; of which I now proceed to give examples.

CLEMENS (A.D. 190), as we have seen, calls the Eucharistic cup " the holy stream of gladness."

CYPRIAN (A.D. 250) has been already quoted amply.

ORIGEN (A.D. 230) on Ps. xxxvi. says : " This inebriation is good." But in Hom. vii. in Lev. x. 8-11, he has many pages, in which he earnestly moralises on the evil of drunkenness. " But, he adds, if we discuss in how many ways the human mind is inebriated, we shall find that even these are drunken who seem to themselves sober. For anger inebriates the mind, and fury makes it worse than drunken, if indeed

anything can be beyond drunkenness. Desire and avarice make a man not only drunken, but even rabid. And obscene lusts inebriate the soul, *as on the contrary ho'y desires inebriate it*, but with that holy ebriety of which one of the holy men has said, Thy inebriating cup, how good is it! But envy and jealously macerate the soul beyond all drunkenness." Origen insists that our Lord literally complied with the charge given to the sons of Aaron. He drank wine during His life, so as to be called a wine-bibber, but when He came to the altar, *i.e.* to offer Himself, He said He would not drink of the fruit of the vine till after His resurrection, Origen understanding Him not to have partaken of the cup which He gave to His disciples.

ATHANASIUS (A.D. 325) says briefly on Ps. xxiii. "This is the joy of the mysteries."

AMBROSE (374) on Psal. xxxvi. §. 19, says, "There is another ebriety through the infusion of the Holy Spirit. They, lastly, who in the Acts spake in divers tongues seemed to the hearers full of new wine." "For the imperfect is the draught of the milk, for the perfect the table of refreshment, of which he said (quotes Ps. xxiii.) \* \* where also is the inebriating cup, whereby sins are washed away or effaced. Good is the ebriety of the saving cup." In Ps. cxix. letter 13, §. 24. "When He hath by divine preaching inebriated the veins of our earth, or soul and mind, He awakeneth earnestness for different virtues, and maketh to grow the fruits of faith and pure devotion, whence truly it is said to Him, 'Thou visitest the earth and inebriatest it;' for by taking

of our flesh He visited, that He might heal the sick ; He inebriated with spiritual joy, that He might, by His pleasantness, soothe the harassed."

In the same place : " Blessed inebriation which maketh the mind in a way to go forth out of itself to things more excellent and joyous, that our mind, forgetting anxieties, may be gladdened with the wine of pleasantness. Excellent inebriation of the Spiritual Table." On Ps. i. "Blessed inebriation, which infuseth joy, bringeth not confusion ; blessed inebriation, which stablisheth the walk of the sober mind ; blessed inebriation, which bedeweth with the gift of eternal life," &c.

THEODORET (430) an unimaginate and sober writer, says on Ps. xxiii. : "This is plain to the initiated (Communicants), and needs no interpretation. For they know that inebriation which strengtheneth and relaxeth not." On Hos. xiv. 5, 6 : "Because our Lord Himself is our corn and wine, whosoever believeth in Him is said to be inebriated." On Ephes. v. 18 : "Casting out the injurious ebriety, he brings in the spiritual."

JEROME (b. 346) Ep. ad Hedib. : "Let us go up with the Lord into the large upper room, and let us receive from Him up there the cup of the New Testament, and keeping there with Him the Passover, let us be inebriated with the wine of soberness." On the words before quoted from the Canticles he observes : "And so will their inebriation be acceptable as the sacrifice of the Altar, and as the horns or corners of the Altar."



GREGORY NYSSEN (Bp. 370) on Canticles: "They are inebriated, as says the prophecy, Ps. xxxiv. 8." So, says he, was David when he saw in an ecstasy that beauty, &c., and cried, "Every man is vanity." So was Paul, he says, when he said, "whether we be beside ourselves, it is unto God." Of St. Peter's Trance in Acts x., he says: "Peter was at the same time hungry and drunken... a Divine and sober drunkenness by which he went out of himself," &c.

PAUL, Bishop of Emesa, (430) "a drunkenness which is the mother of temperance."

THEOPHANES (820), "a sober drunkenness." "To be drunken with a temperate ebriety."

BASIL (370) discourses at large on this "ebriety, the mother of temperance." It is beautiful, but too long to copy.

MACARIUS (370). "If the Holy Spirit was so liberally given under the Old Testament, how much more under the New, where was made the effusion of the Holy Spirit even to ebriety." Twice he has (rendered literally) "We have been intoxicated into the Deity, and replenished and bound by the Holy Spirit."

The late Dean Stanley's phrase, used of the pantheist Spinoza, is to the same effect—"a God-intoxicated man."

CHRYSOSTOM (347-407) on Eph. as above, "admirable is this ebriety..which begets temperance not paralysis..the unpolluted cup of the Lord's blood."

AUGUSTINE (born 354) shall have a fuller quotation, as he explains the reason of this manner of speech. On Ps. xxxvi. he says : "The Psalmist sought a word whereby, through human things, he might express what he would say, and because he saw men immersing themselves in excessive drink, receive wine without measure, and lose their minds, he saw what he should say, because, when that ineffable joy shall be received, the human is in a manner lost, and becometh Divine, and is inebriated with the richness of the House of God." On Ps. civ. : "Let no one look to be inebriated, yea, let every one ; Thy inebriating cup, how excellent is it. We would not say, Let no one be inebriated. Be inebriated ; but see well wherewith. If the excellent Cup of the Lord inebriateth you, that inebriation will be seen in your works, in the holy love of righteousness, in the *alienation of your mind*, but from things earthly to heaven." In his Confessions I. v. : "Who will give me that Thou mayest come into my heart, and inebriate it, that I may forget my miseries, and embrace Thee, my only God?"

This is enough for early days. Is it not as clear as the sun at noon-day that the Christian Church knew nothing of a Communion Wine that was unintoxicating, since the settled phrase of Christians was grounded on the contrary? I will add a few later examples :

ST. BERNARD (1130) even of our Lord : "Was He not drunken with the wine of charity, and forgetful of Himself, in opposition to Peter's counsel, that be far from Thee, Lord?" And a little after, speaking of the character of a true Shepherd of the flock of Christ : "He who rules over

others should be utterly inebriated with the wine of charity, and forgetful of himself." *De Diversis*, xxix. "...charity—for which thou seemest for a while to be forgetful of thyself with a sort of sober drunkenness." Ser. iii. in *Epiph. ad fin.*

ST. ANSELM (1095).—"O Fountain of Life,...make my soul drunk with the sober drunkenness of Thy love, that I may forget whatever is vain and earthly, and may keep Thee alone continually in my memory." "Beautiful," says Julius Hare, who translates the prayer in full.

ARCHBISHOP LEIGHTON, of Glasgow, (1611-1684), was inferior to none of these in learning, taste, and Christian elevation. In his well-known commentary on St. Peter, he says: "Yea, the Lord doth sometimes fill those souls that converse much with Him with such beatific delights, such inebriating sweetness, as I may call it, that it is in a happy manner drunk with these: and the more it enjoys of this, the more is the soul above base intemperance in the use of the delights of the world. As common drunkenness makes a man less than a man, this makes him more; that sinks him below himself, and makes him a beast, this raises him above himself, and makes him an angel."

GILES FLETCHER, an admirable poet of the seventeenth century, in his *Christ's Victory*, has

"And drunk with nectar-torrents, ever hold  
Their eyes on Him."

This language of all the Christian centuries could not have

arisen if our fathers in the faith held with our modern Manicheans, and it is an invincible proof of the novelty and impiety of the doctrines about wine now thrust upon us. ¶

From this also may be at once seen the propriety of this imagery (if it be such, and not the reality) to represent the effect of wrath and misery, as well as of mercy and joy, in great degrees; as both extremes take men out of their ordinary selves, and are beyond the common conditions of human life. See, under *Shechar*, the numerous references, and of them particularly, Isa. xxix. 9, and compare verse 10, "drunken, but not with wine," but with the stupor of spiritual dulness and insensibility. In li. 17: "Awake, awake, stand up, O Jerusalem, which hast drunk at the hand of the Lord the cup of His fury; thou hast drunken the dregs of the cup of trembling, and wrung them out;" and verses 21, 22: "Hear now, thou afflicted, and drunken, but not with wine . . . . I have taken out of thine hand the cup of trembling, even the dregs of the cup of My fury. . . . but I will put it into the hand of them that afflict thee." Plainly, she was beside herself with the miseries which her own sins and God's displeasure had brought upon her; but God will cause this unhappiness to end, and will make her enemies taste it in even greater measure—to the very last drop, down to the very dregs. So Ps. lxxv. 8, and Rev. xiv. 40. For the wicked is the intoxicating cup of God's wrath, which throws them into an ecstasy of misery.

Even common every-day speech employs the word intoxicate in this double way: "intoxicated with joy," "intoxicated

with pride ;" "in an ecstasy of delight," "in an ecstasy of despair ;" "a transport of rage," "a transport of devotion."

Here is a plain fact embedded in the Church's speech for more than two thousand years. It needs no ingenuity to make its witness clear, nor can any ingenuity obscure it. With one word I dismiss this point: the Christian Church did not invent this phraseology ; she found it ready to her hand in the Hebrew Scriptures of prophet and psalmist, and she only continued its use.

---

## CHAPTER V.

### TEMPERANCE MISUSE OF SCRIPTURE.

“The Law is good, if a man use it lawfully.”—*St. Paul.*

The misuse of Scripture by the fanatical party of the total abstainers is as wide as their sect, for that they have become or are becoming, building up walls of separation between themselves and their fellow Christians. Some of the most glaring cases I shall notice later on, but at present I confine myself to two texts, viz. Rom. xiv. 21. “It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak ;” and 1 Cor. viii. 13, “If meat make my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend.” Two different classes of persons use these texts, and will have to be answered differently. The extremists hence infer an inexorable law of abstinence, simple abstainers a counsel of perfection, while the result aimed at by both is a “universal abstinence.” Alas for the fatal facility of such a conclusion ! The words with which St. Chrysostom begins his homily on Rom. xiv. 1, “Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations,” apparently find no response in teetotal understandings : “I am aware that what is here said is to many hard and obscure.” But deferring that general survey which he says is therefore necessary, I observe

1. That the temperance conclusion is far outside the premises ; that "flesh" and "wine" are spoken of in the same breath, are placed on the same footing, and consequently that the scruples of vegetarians and teetotallers are equally entitled to consideration. No one doubts the contempt which our carnivorous Canadian has for the weakness of the former, at the cost of logical consistency.

2. But let us look at the case the Apostle is dealing with. In the Roman Church were some Jewish Christians who had not yet grasped the full import of Christianity, and so were hampered by scruples about Levitical distinctions of days and meats ; or, possibly, they may have been merely ascetics, without reference to the Law, which did not forbid wine. The Gentile Christians had no such scruples. They knew that "all things are clean," and ate all foods with good conscience. But, as knowledge without charity puffeth up, these stronger Christians threw scorn on the weak, and so tempted them to apostasy. Now in dealing with this case, the Apostle passes no censure on the eating, nor does he forbid it ; he only condemns the strong for despising the weak. Again, he does not praise abstaining, but he does forbid the abstainers to "judge," or condemn the non-abstainers, and that, too, with a tone of unusual and indignant severity.

3. Hence neither eating nor abstaining is to be blamed, but scorning on the one side, and condemning on the other. The sum of the matter is, that though the Jew's scruple was ridiculous, he was to be humoured in it, as the Greek word for "receive ye" implies, in the judgment of ancients and



moderns alike. Indeed, St. Chrysostom's comment on the word is "shewing that the thing was to be utterly laughed at." Yet it was "good," that is an excellent thing, though no matter of compulsion, to abstain in those cases where eating and drinking might prove a danger to the faith, and so to the salvation of the scrupulous. But, be it observed, that while commending this voluntary abstinence, it is still maintained that "all things are clean." These are the facts; and can any one who is not the victim of a hopeless hallucination imagine that St. Paul was willing, much less desirous, that the Roman Church should be turned into a Vegetarian Society, thus exposing it to the derision of the world, and imperilling its existence? This would have been absolutely the result, if his words were understood and prevailed according to the mind of the teetotal fanatics. But it was impossible, for two reasons: (a) So meaning the Apostle would have acted in the worst spirit of sectarianism, for he would be setting up his private opinion against that of the Church; he would have been opposing that very decree which he had assisted in promulgating, and which was made with so great a sanction: "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." This charter of the Gentile Churches left free the use of "flesh," excepting only meats offered to idols, things strangled, and blood." I ask the most extravagant abstainer to say now, if he dare, that St. Paul contemplated the general imposition of abstinence from flesh in the Roman Church; and if he did not, where is the propriety of the customary application? (b) But there is another reason. So meaning he would have contradicted his own principles and his express words. When, elsewhere, the Jewish Christians would

impose their rites and scruples on the conscience of their Gentile brethren as of necessary and permanent obligation, St. Paul would not listen to them for a moment. He could, in the case of Timothy, allow of circumcision, to smooth and prosper his ministry among Jewish Christians, and at Rome yield much in the matter of meats; but once there was a whisper of obligation, the Apostle became immovable as a rock. When he went up to Jerusalem, (Gal. ii.), the citadel of Jewish prejudices, and brought Titus, a Greek, with him, he stoutly refused to have him circumcised at the demand of the Judaizers, who made circumcision a necessity, and so destroyed the truth of the Gospel; though under other circumstances he would have as graciously yielded, as in the case of Timothy. Again, at a later day, in the Colossian Church, where an asceticism was rampant, grounded on the old Persian Dualism, of which our Anti-wineism is but an after math, the Apostle did not flinch from the most open hostility to it. Their dogmata or ordinances, "Handle not, nor taste, nor touch," "Are not of any value against the indulgence of the flesh;" or, as many understand it, rather make for the indulgence of the flesh. And such is the "poison" dogma; it does not beat down the carnal temper, but gives it a new opening for gratification in glorying over "moderate drinkers." And now that this revived Manicheism is making many to stumble, it has become a serious duty to resist it. It is perfectly clear, then, that St. Paul is not to be understood in the line of the extremists.

4. But there is the other side, who, adopting a lower

tone, interpret the Apostle's words as but a counsel of perfection. This is nearer the truth. Now, counsels of perfection are for particular persons and particular occasions, and they would wholly lose their character were they made a law for all. The very phrase of the Apostle shows that he is to be understood in this limited sense: "It is good neither to eat flesh," &c. With which compare 1 Cor. vii. 1, "It is good for a man not to touch a woman," a counsel of celibacy, not a prohibition of marriage, under special circumstances. So that the much-abused text makes no more for prohibitionist or abstinence aims than would 1 Cor. vii. 1, for the abolition of matrimony. The scrupulous at Rome were clearly not a strong party, and the Apostle would deal tenderly with them; but the chief point to be observed is, that it was *individual* cases and persons he had in view. If any will candidly read through the whole chapter, he will clearly perceive this, which is summarily expressed in chap. xv. 2. "Let each one of us please his neighbour for that which is good unto edifying." It is a rule for the non-abstainer in his occasional social intercourse with an abstainer, and not a law for the body of the Church. This is still more evident from 1 Cor. viii., where the case is the same, only that at Corinth the scruplers were Gentile converts, while at Rome they were Jews. In chap. x. the Christian is encouraged and directed to eat at a heathen neighbour's table whatever flesh is set before him, or at home whatever was sold in the shambles; thus securing against any misconception the charitable counsel given us in chap. viii. for individual cases. The decree which forbade to Christians meats offered to idols is expressly sustained in x. 28, but all outside

that is free to the Christian "conscience;" but for himself, the Apostle says, he would never in any special case, where it was likely to be hurtful to a brother, eat flesh; and what he expresses in a charitable hyperbole, I have expressed in homely words according to the true meaning.

5. Now degenerate as our Christianity may be deemed, this rule is very generally observed. Non-abstainers of ordinary heedfulness, to say nothing of conscientious Christians, if they chance to have at their table a weak brother who is set off by a glass of wine or spirits, neither offer it nor produce it. This is done as duty and charity, and accords with the letter of our two texts. But if any would impose this abstinence on our conscience as a universal rule, we remind them of the bad company in which this self-same Apostle puts those who "command to abstain from meat," who would turn a temporary concession into a lasting bondage; they are classed with "those who fall away from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron;" and he insists that "every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving." It was from this that Shakespeare borrowed

"Good wine is a good familiar creature, if it be well used."

A voluntary abstinence may be useful, or virtuous, or charitable; but we should resist to the death the attempt which is now so vehemently made to entangle us in the slavery of a Jewish superstition, or, more truly, the Manichean heresy.

## CHAPTER VI.

### SPECIMENS OF TEXTS PERVERTED.

“The Devil saith unto Him, It is written.”—*St. Matthew.*

“The sword of the spirit, which is the word of God,” is a weapon that the world often snatches at, and would fain turn against God. But in vain. It fits no hand but that of a spiritual man. In others hands it is sure to turn and harm the cause in which it is sought to wield it, as Satan found to his cost, and as self-willed and tyrannical philanthropists will certainly one day find no less certainly.

DEUTERONOMY xxxii. 32, 33, of this Dr. Samson says, faithfully followed, of course, by Dr. Patton: “The terms in which Moses (1) commenting on his own record (2) characterizes the wine with which Noah was (3) drugged, calling it ‘the wine of Sodom, the poison of dragons,’ indicates (sic) the (4) recognition of the two classes of wines, intoxicating and unintoxicating, which he (5) makes throughout his connected writings.” So write they all! Here are five absolute falsehoods, which I have numbered. (1) has no excuse whatever. “The song of Moses,” as any one may see who will read it, is a sort of prophetic history of Israel from the beginning to the end—“ad resurrectionem,” as Dr. S.’s authority, Cocceius, somewhat extravagantly says; so that the story and the times of Noah are *necessarily* left out. (2) Consequently there can be no “characterising” where there

is not so much as mention. (3) "Drugged," in the customary use of the word, is an absurd fancy, and contradicts what Dr. S. quotes from Origen. (4) Has been sufficiently shewn to be pure assumption, as also. (5) Suppose for a moment that simply intoxicating wine were meant here ; then, besides a more than poetical extravagance of language, all the miseries of apostate Israel are laid to this one cause, of the correctness of which every reader of the Bible can judge.

"Their vine is of the vine of Sodom" must refer to Israel or to others. In the "master work of Poole" two refer it to others, nine to Israel ; and so of later commentators—Patrick, Rosenmueller, Wordsworth, Maurer. The *vine* represents the Hebrew church, or nation, for which please read Ps. lxxx. 8, 14 ; Jer. ii. 21, where the margin refers you to the place in Deuteronomy ; Isa. v. 1-7. But Israel became a degenerate vine, apostatised from God, so as to deserve to be called a "vine of Sodom," as in Isaiah's day he called her rulers "Sodom rulers," *i. e.*, as bad, as corrupt, as deserving of irreparable overthrow ; and Israel's works, the *wine* of this vine, were of the utmost moral malignity, and were properly likened to the deadly poison of the most destructive creatures. It was allowable enough in the ascetic and rhetorical Jerome, and, indeed, would be in a matter-of-fact writer now, to accommodate Moses's words to the bad effects of drunkenness ; but to assume repeatedly that they were *first spoken in this connection* is to insult the common sense of men, and to make a fool of Moses.

PROVERBS XXIII. 29-35. This is referred to *seven* times in

Dr. S.'s pages, and he says: "These are unqualified in their declaration," p. 25. And so say they all. I refer the reader to the Bible for this long passage. The catalogue of evils here are referred by the corrupters of reason and Scripture to wine, instead of to drunkenness. I have before me a Sunday School Lesson, filling nearly two pages of a religious newspaper, which is one elaborate perversion, and which will one day, when the juvenile mind works for itself, help on a terrible revulsion: it is from "International Lessons, 7th December, 1884." Now the wise man answers clearly his own question, "Who hath woe?" &c.; and he does not say, "Those who drink wine," but "*They that tarry long at the wine.*" First of all, it is not a single drinking bout that works the mischief; for the verb *tarry* is in the participial form, *meakharim*, signifying those who are in the habit of such long and late drinking, and this is represented in the translation by *long*; and so Fuerst, under the verb *akhar*, renders "tarry late." Indeed, *tarry* would be enough, but it so clearly means a long sitting that translators feel bound to emphasize that point. So Maurer, one of Dr. S.'s authorities, explains by *ad multam noctem potant*, "drink far into the night." Then, as an aggravation of all this, such persons are further described, "*They that go to seek mixed wine.*" They want still stronger drink, which they will take any trouble to *seek* out. The word implies, according to Fuerst, "finding out by minute and persevering investigation:" with which very well accords Moses Stuart's explanation of the other participle *baim*, not simply "go," but who are in the habit of "entering in" to the houses of sale. Here, then, is, in one short verse, a perfect picture of



the most abandoned drunkard, and all that is said of him is applied calmly to such as drink at all! Is not this an unpardonable wickedness? done, too, in the name of religion! Then this precious "Lesson" disowns religion by saying (its own italics) "There is *only one safeguard* against the danger of drunkenness, total abstinence from alcoholic drinks." "That, and that alone, is a certain safeguard." True, it puts in a parenthesis, for propriety's sake in a S. S. Lesson, "under the grace of God,"—though why, it is not easy to see the necessity of, if we have so much security without it: for it adds, drunkenness "to him who tastes not is impossible." The Lord deliver our S. S. scholars from this miserable unchristian Yankee teaching? "Look not upon the wine," is the wise and necessary charge to such a drunkard. For such an one reason and religion combine in saying his safety lies in abstinence; and no more can be made of it.

It is interesting to observe how strongly the Septuagint has marked all the qualifications:—"Who tarry over their wine-bouts—track out where drinks are made—be not drunken in your wine-bouts—if thou give thine eyes to the bowls and cups." All which befits a drunkard only.

ISAIAH v. 11, is similarly abused, and similarly rescued from the hands of the abusers. "Woe unto them that rise up early in the morning, that they may follow strong drink; that continue until night till wine inflame them." V. 22. "Woe unto them that are mighty to drink wine, and men of strength to mingle strong drink." "God's woes are

thundered upon the drinkers of wine and strong drink," says one of these reckless writers. No; but upon, in this place, determined drunkards; who make a business of drinking from the "break of day" till the "twilight;" (see the lexicons under *boker* and *nesheph*); the *purpose* of whose life is to *pursue* drink; who are *mighty*, yea, *heroes* in the way of drinking. Yet the sober and the abstemious are put on a level with such sinners by these adulterators of God's word! In this same chapter are some other "woes" that should find more place in temperance books: "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter." This is a woe as sure and as deserved as the woe denounced against drunkenness.

HABAKKUK ii. 15, is another of the much abused texts. Even the ignorant would not mistake the meaning of the text, were it not constantly garbled. "Woe unto him that giveth his neighbour drink, that puttest thy bottle to him," here the quoters usually stop; even *Doctors* Samson and Patton are not ashamed to stop here! because the next words would deprive their quotation of point: "and *makest* him *drunken* also." So that it is not the giving of drink, but the making drunken that is reprehended. Nay, nor even is that, bad as it is, the object of the woe; but something worse still, and separated from the preceding only by a *comma*, "that thou mayest look on their nakedness;" *i. e.*, the object of the enforced drunkenness was to expose its unhappy, helpless subject to utter scorn and derision. But the true wording of the text cuts off entirely the Temperance mis-

application of it. The prophet denounces the merciless oppressions of the Chaldeans. They made the weaker nations around them mad with cruel injustice, and then mocked their misery. He compares their conduct to that of a brutal man who should *force* his neighbour to get drunk, forcing the liquor down his throat, as "cowboys" are reported to do on Texas railroad trains, so as to make him an object of derision to all beholders, fun for a brutal crowd. However, he warns the Chaldean oppressor that his turn was coming. "Drink thou, also, and let thy foreskin be uncovered: the cup of the Lord's right hand shall be turned unto thee, and shameful spewing shall be on thy glory." This imagery I have already commented on. "Drink thou, also," might, with as much propriety, be made an encouragement for drinking, as "woe unto him," be quoted against offering drink to our neighbour in the way of hospitality. When I say that the Hebrew word translated by "giveth drink," really means "forcing him to drink," and the Hebrew for "putting thy bottle to him," means "pouring in thy bottle full," as Fuerst translates it in his *Lexicon*; or, as Maurer, *qui infundis iram tuam atque adeo inebrias*, "who pourest in thy anger, and so inebriatest;" enough is said to show that the idea of force is contained in the bare words as well as in the argument, and force for a most vile and barbarous purpose. And yet, "sipping his glass of sherry," falls, according to the Temperance authorities, under this woe !\*

\*The Revised Version deprives the temperance orator of his best-beloved and most picturesque verse, as the "bottle" goes:—"Woe unto him that giveth his neighbour drink, that addest (or pourest)

These will serve as specimens of the terrible profanity with which sacred words are treated, showing how debauched the writers' consciences are, and how deadening such literature must be to the moral instincts of those among whom it circulates, especially to their reverence for truth.

I shall end with briefly noticing two other instances, as bad as any, of this utter moral perverseness.

In 1 TIMOTHY III. 3, among the qualifications of a bishop is, "not given to wine." On this Dr. Patton has, p. 111: "*Paroinos* compounded *παρὰ* and *οἶνος*, literally, not at, by, near, or with wine. This looks considerably like *total abstinence*"—with much more as uncharitable as this is childish. It is as if we explained St. Peter's words, "who was I that I could withstand God?" by standing at, by, near, or with God! But it is of a piece with the rest of his ignorance. The *Revised Version* has "no brawler," and in the margin, "or, not quarrelsome over wine"; which was expressed in the margin of the common Bible, and might have saved Dr. Patton from his miserable blunder: "Not ready to quarrel, and offer wrong, as one in wine." For this meaning there is the amplest authority. In ISAIAH XLI. 12, it is said to Israel of her oppressors: "Thou shalt seek them and shalt not find them, even them that *contended* with thee." In the Septuagint, or old Greek, it is: "Thou shalt not at all find the men who *shall treat thee with insolence and injury*," *paroinousin*. So did the thy venom (or fury) thereto, and makest him drunken also, that thou mayest look on their nakedness."

oldest version, the Syriac, understand it : 'obar 'al khamro "a transgressor over wine," as Etheridge literally translates it." So Herodotus says Cambyzes "*treated with insolence the laws of the Egyptians.*" So Hesychius, the old Greek lexicographer. "*Paroinia* is the injuriousness, and every sort of sin that springs from wine." In Athenceus it is the climax of "wine, drunkenness, madness, and even *paroinia*," where it is the *effect* of all the rest. Clem. Alex. : "*Paroinia* is the indecency and disorder that springs from the use of wine." St. Chrysostom so understood the text : "*Paroinos* does not here signify a drunkard, but an injurious, a proud, self-willed man." And so Alford, Ellicott, and Wordsworth, all excellent commentators on the Greek Testament. Again, in p. 8, "Deacons must be not given to *much* wine," addicting themselves to. Surely the "much" and "given,\* or addicting themselves to," most clearly imply that a reasonable and modest use of wine is allowed, or words cease to have any meaning ; and yet even such language must mean "total abstinence"! Can the Bible be of any use to such interpreters?

In TITUS II. 3, the "aged" Christian "women" of Crete are charged not to be "given to much wine." But the Greek is stronger here than in the places just discussed, and is properly represented by the Revised Version, "Not enslaved to much wine." Such is Etheridge's translation of the Syriac : "Enslaved to much wine." The verb is *sha'aved*,

\* The same verb *prosechein* is translated "give heed to" in 1 Tim. iv. 1, Tit. i. 14; and "give attendance to," 1 Tim. iv. 13; Heb. vii. 13.

to bring in to slavery, for which see Heb. ii. 15 ; Jas. iv. 7 ; Gal. ii. 5. Here again are two large qualifications even for "aged women," *much* and *enslaved*. Does it not show a mind bereft of reason, bereft of reverence for sacred Scripture, and I think I may say abandoned of God, to insist on this language being consistent with the Divine injunction of total abstinence, as Dr. P. insists ? p. 121.

---

I have now ended my task. I have shewn, beyond any fear of effective contradiction, what blind guides are the Temperance writers, and what is much worse, what wilfully blind guides they are. I have shewn how much they prefer a theory to the most venerable authority ; to what violence and indignity that authority is subjected to make it somehow square with their own wilfulness ; and from this every reader of sense and candour, and especially every religious man, will be constrained to infer that such a literature is demoralizing to the instincts of honesty and reverence, calculated to debauch the communities among which it circulates, and to give rise to a crop of new mischiefs not at all dreamt of by the mass of men, and but even dimly imagined by the most perspicacious and farsighted. I have abstained from all topics but the one I proposed—the Temperance perversion of Scripture. There is much else to be said against the prohibition that is desired ; but I leave it to other hands or other occasions. And certainly much may be said for it—enough, if it be a sound principle, without laying violent hands on things sacred ; and if I have done something to prevent the continuance or repetition of this profanity in the future, I have done as I intended, and have not written in vain.







